# THE MIND OF JESUS

LOUIS HOWLAND

OCT 16 1959

# THE MIND OF JESUS

# THE MIND OF JESUS

*By*

LOUIS HOWLAND

AUTHOR OF

*Day Unto Day, Life of Stephen A. Douglas*

EVANGELICAL SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

7659

INDIANAPOLIS
THE BOBBS-MERRILL COMPANY
PUBLISHERS

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BT
590
.T6
H68
1926
47,930

COPYRIGHT, 1926
BY THE BOBBS-MERRILL COMPANY

*Printed in the United States of America*

PRINTED AND BOUND
BY BRAUNWORTH & CO., INC.
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK

TO

HEWITT HANSON HOWLAND

WITH THE AFFECTION

OF THE AUTHOR

"Highest of all symbols are those wherein the artist or poet has risen into the prophet, and all men can recognize a present God, and worship the same: I mean religious symbols. If thou ask to what height man has carried it in this manner, look on our divinest symbol: on Jesus of Nazareth, and his life, and his biography, and what followed therefrom. Higher has the human thought not yet reached: this is Christianity; a symbol of quite perennial, infinite character; whose significance will ever demand to be anew inquired into, and anew made manifest."—CARLYLE.

# CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I | Introductory | 11 |
| II | Heretical | 14 |
| III | Radical or Conservative | 25 |
| IV | Inclusive | 31 |
| V | Undogmatic | 37 |
| VI | Flexibility | 48 |
| VII | Mental Approach | 56 |
| VIII | Poetical | 64 |
| IX | Scientific | 73 |
| X | The Higher Logic | 84 |
| XI | Realities | 94 |
| XII | Mysteries and Mysticisms | 105 |
| XIII | Oriental | 113 |
| XIV | Contradictories | 121 |
| XV | Keenness | 129 |
| XVI | Delicacy | 139 |
| XVII | Purity | 147 |

## CONTENTS—*Continued*


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| XVIII | Poise | 157 |
| XIX | Prophetic | 163 |
| XX | The Intellectuals | 172 |
| XXI | Evangelicals | 180 |
| XXII | Institutional | 186 |
| XXIII | Light | 194 |
| XXIV | Knowledge and Love | 202 |
| XXV | Personality | 210 |
| XXVI | Conclusion | 221 |

# THE MIND OF JESUS

# THE MIND OF JESUS

## I

## INTRODUCTORY

Not for many years has there been as keen and great an interest in Jesus Christ and all that pertains to his life and character as now. It matters little that men, in their efforts to understand him and establish a living contact with him, have seemed to cheapen him, if such a thing be possible, for it is the effort to understand that is important. That it will bear fruit one hardly dares doubt. Even now the figure of Jesus is beginning to acquire a definiteness of outline which it has not had for many years. Men are coming to see him as brother, friend and co-worker without losing anything of the sense of his divinity. He stands before the

world as the representative and incarnation of a laboring, loving, suffering and self-sacrificing God who cares infinitely for both the bodies and souls of men. No greater conception can there be than that of a God who serves as well as rules, a God who is not a despot throned in a distant realm but a companion and helper of men, who lives in men, as they in him. Surely that is the Christian revelation. "God with us" is one of the names of Jesus Christ.

But in much of what has been and is being written little has been said of Jesus as an intellectual force. Writers and teachers have concerned themselves mostly with his character, his teaching and doctrine, his works and the events of his life, while the great church councils have dealt in elaborate and perplexing detail with his "person" and "being." Perhaps there is need for a new attempt—for the subject has by no means been wholly passed over—however inadequate, not so much to interpret the mind of Jesus as manifested in his attitude toward man and man's general life, as to give a picture of that mind and its method of working. This will, of course, involve a discussion of the part that

intellect should play in religion—a discussion which would itself afford a theme for a book.

The primary question is obviously one of personality. Long ago it was said that as a man "thinketh in his heart, so is he." What a man thinks, that he very largely is. The mind of Jesus, therefore, as the mind of every one else, is a very important element—if not the determining element—in his personality. Only two sources will be drawn on, first, the accounts given in the Gospels, and second (and derivatively), the admitted and obvious influence that Jesus had on the minds of his first disciples, as revealed especially in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles. In the process of reasoning Jesus reached certain conclusions. These are important, not only in themselves or because they are his, but as throwing light on his mind and its way of operating. What Jesus thought about certain matters can often be known only—or at any rate be known best—from his acts in connection with them. This study—if so humble an effort may be dignified by that name—will have to do with the inner nature of Jesus, as far as I may be able to penetrate it.

## II

### HERETICAL

SHOCKING as it may seem to many, Jesus was, first of all, from the religious point of view of his day, intellectually a heretic. The word has not the evil significance that it once had, and yet there are many even to-day in whom the mere utterance of it excites something very like horror. Yet it may actually be a badge of honor, as history shows, and as poets and prophets have demonstrated both by word and deed. We are not shocked at the word in a stanza of Lowell's poem, *The Present Crisis*:

"By the light of burning heretics Christ's bleeding feet I track,
Toiling up new Calvaries ever with the cross that turns not back,
And these mounts of anguish number how each generation learned

One new word of that grand *Credo* which in
prophet-hearts hath burned
Since the first man stood God-conquered with
his face to heaven upturned."

Throughout the whole course of his ministry Jesus was at open war with the accredited church authorities, yet all the while he was a member of the church of Israel. He did not do, nor did he require his disciples to do, what the church authorities commanded in the matter of fasting, ceremonial washings or Sabbath observance. It has perhaps not been sufficiently noted that his attitude was precisely that of the old prophets who denounced new moons and Sabbaths and sacrifices of bulls and goats as in themselves availing nothing. The God of Isaiah thundered against them all, and turned to realities, as thus: "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." That is the Christ idea. Micah was another heretic, who almost bitterly condemned material sacrifices, and, speaking for

Jehovah, concluded thus: "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Here are attacks on the most cherished and sacred institutions and customs of the Hebrew people, institutions and customs which they had been taught to believe were of divine ordering. As the centuries passed these customs multiplied, became more complicated, and were hardened into a system. In his attitude toward them Jesus was a fulfillment of the prophets, and of their spiritual lineage. In him we see the old revolt of the prophet against the priest. He, like his predecessors, fearlessly followed truth wherever it led, and when any of the old dogmas were found by him to be inconsistent with the truth he abandoned or overruled them. "It hath been said by them of old time, but I say unto you"—such was his attitude.

He and his disciples many times refused to follow the customs of the Jewish church, of which he and they were members, and he was bitterly condemned for his non-conformity. There is not

the slightest warrant for our Sabbatarianism in anything that Jesus said or did. On the contrary, he openly broke the Sabbath law, thus abrogating the Fourth Commandment as it was then understood, at least by enlarging, reinterpreting and spiritualizing it. It is true that he justified his action on the ground that "the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath." But that he did not rely wholly on his divine nature as a defense is proved by his further saying that "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath." Further, he appealed to the law-breaking precedent set by David when "he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar the high priest, and did eat the shew-bread, which is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave also to them which were with him." It is no explanation to say that Jesus was divine, or that he was God, for he taught his followers to do and think as he did.

It has been said that light was to be had on the mind of Jesus from the influence that he exerted on his followers after he left the earth. It was his spirit that triumphed when the Apostles, in

council assembled, decided to exempt Gentile Christians from the necessity of circumcision, thus abolishing an ancient rite, and one that they, as Jews, could not but have believed was instituted by God. "Why tempt ye God," asked St. Peter, "to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" The interesting and significant fact is that there should have been this free and liberal treatment by the Apostles of what they had been taught to believe was divine truth. That many Christians, practically all of whom were at that time Jews, looked on the decision as heretical there can be no doubt. For it was from them that the demand had come for the retention of the old rite. The decision of the Apostles was inspired by their Master, was in entire accord with the spirit of his teaching, and proved that they had "been with Jesus." There could hardly be a more striking case of modernism.

Jesus flatly overruled Moses, and so strongly did he assert himself on one occasion that the Jews asked: "Art thou greater than our father

Abraham, which is dead? and the prophets are dead: whom makest thou thyself?" It is curious that many Christians should insist that men shall accept the Old Testament as in every detail binding on them, and to be believed *en bloc,* though Jesus and the Apostolic Church took directly the opposite view. The present slavishness to the letter of the Bible came in with the Protestant Reformation, and it is an evil inheritance. Strangely enough a modern Pope saw fit to impose this literalism on the great church of which he was the head.

If it be said that what has been spoken of as heresy was not that at all, but simply a break with the old kingdom which had to come if the new one was to be founded, the answer is that the original purpose was not to establish a new kingdom, but to renew and vivify the old, to bring it into touch with the spiritual life of man. Hence the many appeals of Jesus to what was best in the old.

Jesus was loyal to the church of his people, and a devout Jew. He said that he was "sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and

that "salvation is of the Jews." To the woman of Canaan, who came asking him to heal her daughter, he said: "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it unto the dogs." His first effort was to free the old church from the fetters by which it seemed to him to be bound, and his war with the rulers and priests was in behalf of the church which he sought to spiritualize. His attitude was, as has been said, that of the old prophets, that of every prophet in every age of the world, who, if he is to be a prophet, must of necessity be a heretic in the eyes of those who stand for the old order in its entirety. The struggle between prophet and priest is as old as the religious life of man—we are in the midst of such a conflict to-day.

What Jesus brought into the world was a new spirit, a fresh way of looking at things—both old and new—a new vision. He did not pretend that he had revealed all truth, for he said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." To hold that all truth is contained in

the Bible—indeed St. John expressly says that it is not—is to discredit this same Spirit, and to limit or attempt to limit his function, which is to teach. It is also to set aside and repudiate the promise of Jesus. What was promised was a progressive revelation, one that should grow in clearness, vividness, completeness and power till the end of time. The pledge has been splendidly redeemed, and is being redeemed daily. Every ray of truth and knowledge that has flashed on the world since the days of Jesus on earth—even evolution—is of divine origin. To fight against new truth, or the efforts to win it, is, therefore, to fight against God.

Of the mind of Jesus it must then apparently be said that it was of a liberal cast, and distinctly forward-looking and forward-reaching. It is impossible to think of him as concerned with the method of creation, or with the six-day story of Genesis. Nor did he ever show the remotest interest in the method or manner of his birth. What he was interested in was, not creation, but re-creation. He had nothing to say of physical birth, his own or another's, virgin or in ordinary

generation, but much to say of the new or spiritual birth, which lay at the very heart of his teaching. If his mind were visibly operating in the religious world of our own day we should undoubtedly see many results that would startle the orthodox—and perhaps the liberals as well.

Those effects would startle the liberals—or many of them—because they would see, as they ought to see now, that Jesus never opposed any doctrine or institution because it was old, or championed any new thing simply because it was new. One of his greatest services was to throw light on old truth, and to bring to men's minds old truth that had been forgotten. We think of his command to love God and neighbor as new, but he himself says "this is the law and the prophets"—the old law which had been formalized and standardized to such an extent that men had lost sight of its spirit. Thus he made the old live again. "Therefore," he said, "every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old."

The war between prophet and priest was never a war between old and new—on the contrary the Hebrew prophets almost invariably appealed to a great past—but between shadow and substance, between what was merely conventional and respectable on the one hand, and what, on the other hand, was real and true. Their effort was—and it was also the effort of Jesus—to apply what was best in the past to contemporary conditions, to give men a right understanding of the past, and to discriminate between that in it which was temporary, of minor importance and mechanical, and that which was permanent, of eternal value and spiritual. Revolution has often meant recovery from present degeneracy, and a return to the great days of old. That this was the first thought of Jesus seems to be clear.

The question then is, after all, who are the heretics? Those who cling fast to present mistakes and evils because they are regular, established and orthodox, or those who insist that they are really novelties, unsupported by the very authorities to whom their defenders appeal? Viewed thus Jesus was no heretic—the heresy

was with those who condemned him. But that is true also of many a man held in his time, and held even yet by many, to be a heretic. There is such a thing as heretical orthodoxy. Jesus was what he claimed to be—both prophet and priest. There is no reason in the nature of things why the two offices should not be combined in the same personality. Only they almost never have been. The priest tends to become more and more priestly and less and less prophetical, and that is why prophets are so necessary—never more so than to-day.

## III

### RADICAL OR CONSERVATIVE

THE answer to the question at the head of this section is, I think, that Jesus was neither the one nor the other—or, perhaps better, both. Some of his doctrines are highly revolutionary, and certainly the result of his life and work on earth was one of the greatest revolutions of history. Yet he said: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." This is not the language of a radical or revolutionist, and yet it is found in the most revolutionary of all the utterances of Jesus—the Sermon on the Mount.

Men dwell on and emphasize the words that seem to sustain their views, ignoring those that

do not. The principle enunciated by Jesus in connection with Sabbath observance is a case in point. Out of this, those who would make Sunday like any other day of the week derive much comfort—comfort to which they are not entitled. For Jesus said "the Sabbath was made for man"—that is it was a blessing to man. It was made for man because, such is the argument, it was needed by man. Jesus came, not to destroy the Sabbath, but to "fulfill" it—to fulfill it by overthrowing the idea that man was made for the Sabbath. That is, Jesus was a radical and revolutionist as against contemporary, false, mechanical and cruel conceptions of the Sabbath, but a conservative in his attitude toward what he clearly regarded as, when rightly understood, a great and very valuable religious and social institution. What he opposed was, not the Sabbath day, but the Sabbath code. The rule by which he governed his intellectual processes was formulated by him, and in connection with a question of Sabbath observance, thus: "Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment."

To take another case, and one that illustrates well the thought of Jesus of the relation between old and new. First, let it be said that he never broke with the church of his people. He made a distinction between the church and what was, as he thought, bad in it. "The scribes and the Pharisees," he said, "sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not." Then follows a denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees terrible in its fierceness. Though they were not to be imitated, they were to be obeyed—because they "sit in Moses' seat."

But the case to which I have referred as making clear the mental attitude of Jesus toward the old and the new, and toward the relation between them, occurred on the last night of his life on earth. Facing death in awful form on the next day—he kept the Passover. When he had "sat down, and the twelve apostles with him, he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer." Centuries before, Moses had said: "Ye shall ob-

serve this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy sons forever." Jesus obeyed the command, and kept the feast, not as a formality, but because "with desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer." Yet immediately afterward he instituted the Eucharist in which the old feast was merged, and, to use his language, "fulfilled."

Is it not true then to say that Jesus was neither a conservative nor a radical? He towered far above any such distinctions. Valuing the continuity of human experience, he labored to save all that was good in the past and to make it helpful and fruitful, and to avoid a break except on moral and spiritual grounds. With his passionate devotion to reality, he would supersede and destroy all that was unreal, either because men had misinterpreted and misapplied it, or because it had been outgrown.

Jesus was both prophet and priest, both radical and conservative, because he was also king—king in and of the kingdom of the truth. It was in his kingly nature that the functions of prophet and priest were reconciled. Truth in

this world has many enemies, among them hypocrisy, pretense and mere conventionality, and it was against these that Jesus directed his attack. Nothing was sacred to, or spared by him that was tainted with these. But truth in the days of Jesus—and this is quite as true now—had another foe to contend with, and that was wrong and erroneous conceptions of it, and faulty statements in which men had attempted to embody it. This conflict between the truth and perversions or misunderstandings of it, almost always innocent, is as old as human history. It is part of the inheritance of man. Truth expands and grows, and unless men grow too—as often they do not—there is bound to be maladjustment. When the eternal truth came into the world in the person of Jesus, war between reality and unreality became a certainty. Perhaps this was what Jesus meant when he said: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword."

It is, therefore, no question of radical or conservative, of prophet or priest, of old or new, of heresy or orthodoxy, but rather of the relation of

the soul and mind of man to truth, and, in the present discussion, of the mind of Jesus to the truth. That is the great question of our time, as of all times. The very existence of Jesus was a challenge, not only to what was false, but also to what was only partly true. Conventions and customs that had been emptied of all reality and life meant nothing to him—indeed they were to him an offense, things to be got rid of. So he was prophet and priest, radical and conservative, a lover of the old and a promulgator of the new, not because he was a compromiser, but rather because he was and is "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto."

## IV

### INCLUSIVE

Jesus never excluded any one from association and fellowship with him because of non-acceptance of the virgin birth, or on the basis of any dogma. Indeed, there were few whom he did exclude, and they were for the most part those whom we should think of to-day as good people. The life to which he called men was hard, not because he asked much in the way of dogmatic belief—for little was asked—but because moral and spiritual standards were set so high. I think it may with truth be said that he almost never defined. He lived the life to which he called others, and summoned all men to fellowship in that life. He acknowledged as his co-workers and allies those who were not members of the Apostolic band—which was the church *in posse*—and who had not avowed belief in him.

The narrow church spirit began to show itself, and on many occasions, while Jesus was yet on earth. Here is an example: "John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us; and we forbad him, because he followeth not us." There it is, that spirit that is responsible for so many sad and terribly tragic pages in church history. The attitude of the disciples was precisely that of the church authorities to-day who would exclude from the ministry, and even from church membership, men who accept the great truths of Christianity, but not in the sense in which they are held by the excluders, and who, better yet, are doing the works of Christianity. All that Jesus cared about was that the devils were being cast out. "He followeth not us"—such is still the charge. How those guilty of this exclusiveness can fail to take to heart the rebuke of Jesus it is difficult to see. Here is his answer to St. John: "Forbid him not; for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part." The chapter con-

cludes thus: "Have peace one with another." The man whom the disciples would have forbidden to minister, in the name of Jesus, to the afflicted, was accepted by Jesus as friend, associate, and fellow-laborer. "He that is not against us is on our part."

Jesus did apply tests and searching ones, but they all bore directly on life. To the young ruler he said: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me." "Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead," he said to one of his disciples who asked to be allowed first to go and bury his father.

Among the many "hard sayings" of Jesus few are harder than the following: "Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life." To one who, before entering on his discipleship, would have bidden farewell to those at home in his house, Jesus said: "No man, having put his hand

to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." "If any man," he again said, "will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it."

These tests, and such as they, are hardly ever thought of. Rich and prosperous men, who never even shook hands with self-denial, think it enough if they believe that the world was created in six days, that Joshua caused the sun to stand still, and that God commanded the butchery of women and children and the murder of prisoners. But when it comes to real sacrifices, to a personal and absolute loyalty to Jesus Christ, these literalists at once begin to construe, interpret and explain.

Here is the trouble, or a very large part of the trouble, with present-day Christianity. There is an utter failure to enter into, or even to try to enter into, the mind of Jesus. It was—and this is the quality that I would now dwell on—splendidly inclusive. Who were his brethren? We are not left in doubt: "While he yet talked to

the people, behold, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him. Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered unto him that told him, Who is my mother and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother!" "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven"—not whosoever shall believe or say that he believes certain things about God and Christ. He who called Matthew the publican, dined with Zaccheus, received the sinful Magdalene, forgave the thief on the cross, and spoke the tender parable of the Prodigal Son, would not, it is to be feared, have been at home in the council of Nicæa, the sixteenth-hundredth anniversary of which the world has recently celebrated, a council presided over by an emperor, and very earnest over questions of "procession" and "substance." Whether he would have smiled at

it or wept over it one can not say, but one or the other he would almost certainly have done.

Such a Christianity as that of Jesus, forward-looking, inclusive and tenderly sympathetic, would soon conquer the world, touch and win the hearts of men, inspire and control their consciences, and mold and cleanse their lives. Yet there are those in the churches who seem to be determined that the world shall not have it. And that is the greatest tragedy of our time, for it means that, as far as the influences referred to are concerned, the greatest need of our suffering, sinning race is not to be satisfied. It is suggested that men and women carefully and prayerfully read their New Testament, read it, as far as possible, as a new book, not for the purpose of buttressing doctrine, but with a view to learning, as far as it is within the power of human beings to learn, what Jesus thought about the great realities of life.

## V

### UNDOGMATIC

WHETHER the mind of Jesus was dogmatic or undogmatic depends obviously on what we mean by dogma. I recently read a letter in the London *Spectator* written by the Bishop of Pretoria arguing that Jesus was dogmatic because he taught the Fatherhood of God, which is a dogma. He taught much else that may be so called, and probably with truth. In a very real sense all teaching, if it is to be of any value, must be dogmatic. The trouble with much of it today is that it is not sufficiently so. The Bishop, after all, put the case very well: "The ecclesiastical mind is (who will deny?) capable of dogmatic bigotry and of arrogance in the face of that which is in the end never finally searchable. But to say that we should fling dogma out is,

I plead, allied to lunacy. As well might we propose to walk without a backbone." That is also true.

But the dogmatist to whom Jesus bore no resemblance is the man who wears his skeleton—backbone and the rest—on the outside. Jesus surely refused to dogmatize on many subjects, and in regard to some he freely confessed his own ignorance, as thus: "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Men have always dogmatized on this subject—as they are doing to-day—but Jesus did not. If truth, love, gentleness, goodness, purity, childlikeness, faith, mercy, forgiveness and self-renunciation are dogmas, then Jesus was the prince of dogmatists. But if by dogma we mean "that which in the end is never searchable," then Jesus was in no sense a dogmatist. What he taught was the fruit of action and experience—this on his own authority—and not something imposed, as dogma, as generally understood, always is. He

made, as we have seen, large demands in the way of character and life, but little in the way of assent to articles of belief.

Much has been said and written of St. Peter's great confession at Cæsarea Philippi, but what was it? "Thou are the Christ, the Son of the living God," such is the report of it given by St. Matthew. St. Mark gives an even simpler form: "Thou art the Christ." Dogmas they both are, of course, but how different from those of the Athanasian creed, or the confessions of the Reformation divines!

The faith that Jesus required of those who cried to him for help was, as a rule, simply belief in his power to do what was asked of him. It was the faith of the palsied man's friends that, through Jesus, wrought the cure—a faith that was manifestly confidence that relief could and would be had. The faith of the ruler who asked that his dead daughter be restored to life was thus expressed: "My daughter is even now dead; but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live." It was so with the poor woman who said: "If I may but touch his garment, I

shall be whole"—and she was, in response to her belief in the power of Jesus. When two blind men prayed that their sight might be restored, Jesus asked: "Believe ye that I am able to do this?" The account continues: "They said unto him, Yea, Lord. Then touched he their eyes, saying, According to your faith be it unto you. And their eyes were opened"—opened because the men believed that Jesus could open them. That was their creed. The faith of the woman of Canaan, whose daughter was healed, was shown in her belief in the divine power of Jesus, in her persistence, and in her refusal to be repulsed. It prevailed, and won the commendation of Jesus: "O woman, great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt." The prayer of the leper was "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean"—such was his confession of faith. It was so with the centurion, concerning whom Jesus said: "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."

In other cases he healed the sick without any declaration of faith, or, apparently, any manifestation of it. The confession of the man that

was born blind did not come until after his cure. In none of these cases did Jesus demand that those to be cured should declare that he was "God of God, Light of Light, very God of Very God," and the rest of it. In all of them, however, faith is dealt with as of great importance. But dare any one say that it was dealt with dogmatically, or that Jesus thought of it as in any sense a dogma? Rather it was trust in a power, an adventure, a throwing of self on God who "loves the burden."

There are two errors which men make, errors that have had—and still have—serious consequences. In the first place they confuse steadfastness to firmly held conviction with dogmatism. Those who think it dogmatic to have convictions give them up in order to avoid dogmatism. To such people nothing is ever quite true, and to them no question—not even the simplest—is presented that has not two sides. They boast that they know nothing. These are they of the so-called "open mind." As compared with them Jesus was intensely dogmatic, in the fine sense of the word. But as compared with

the creed-makers from Nicæa down he was the most undogmatic being who ever trod this earth. He was no eclectic in religion, no waverer, no preacher of contradictions as both alike true. He was direct and positive—"he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes."

But what he taught with authority was a way of life, and he proclaimed, not definitions, but life principles. Salvation was to be the portion of him who "heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them"—salvation was not attached to correct opinions about him or his person. It was in reply to the question of a certain scribe that Jesus gave the two great commandments enjoining love of God and love of neighbor. Then follows this: "And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth; for there is one God; and there is none other but he: And to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far

from the kingdom of God." The man had entered into the very spirit of Jesus, and of the great prophets. His thought was centered, not on rules or ritual or formal confessions, but on the deepest realities, which were, and are, "more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices." And so he was "not far from the kingdom of God." His thought was, not merely that it was right to love God and his neighbor, but that there was enormous spiritual value in doing so.

The other error to which reference has been made is confusing faith with belief in certain doctrines or dogmas. It would be difficult to exaggerate the harm traceable to this error. The candidate for baptism in the Episcopal Church is asked: "Dost thou believe all the articles of the Christian faith, as contained in the Apostles' creed?" One may believe those articles and yet be without faith as Jesus understood it, for faith is vastly more than belief. Of course the candidate is asked a great deal more, as thus: "Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and all the sinful

desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow, nor be led by them? Wilt thou then obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life?" The point is that the demand for faith—not mere belief—is found in these latter questions, rather than in the question as to the acceptance of the creed.

There are many who accept—or say they do—one of the numerous creeds, and assume that they have done all that is required of them, and that they are Christians because of such acceptance. They may or may not be—often are not. Men may, as the phrase is, believe in the Bible yet be wholly without faith, which really is not mere belief, but a movement or leap of the human toward the divine soul. To dogmatize on such a subject is impossible, and Jesus never did. He did differentiate between what was important and what was not important, or less important. Here is an illustration: "As Jesus sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples. And when the Pharisees saw it, they

said unto his disciples, Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners? But when Jesus heard that, he said unto them, They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." Here he who would reform and spiritualize the religion of his day turns to an old truth which had once been central to its life but which had been forgotten and overlaid with ritual and formalism. For the words are those of the prophet Hosea: "For I have desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings."

Those who are so fearful lest Christianity be overthrown or injured by those who are trying to get at the heart of it, would do well to reflect that, as in the case just cited, what often seems new and dangerous and false is really old and true, and that those who are condemned as radicals are frequently the truest conservatives. So we may go back to Christ, or even to the great church fathers, such as Basil or Chrysostom, to show that the literal interpreters of the Old Tes-

tament are far out of the way—that they indeed are the innovators.

The mind of Jesus, then, as used by him in handling the great problems of life, was not dogmatic—it was in truth anything but that. His creed was such a belief in his Father, such a trust in him and love for him, as drove him—for he sometimes shrank from the test—to do that Father's will. The faith of those who came to him was belief in his power and goodness, in his love for them, in his willingness to help. That, it seems to me, is a living faith, and nothing else is. Yet in our time—and the pity of it!—men are dogmatizing over inspiration, the six-day creation, Noah's ark, the tower of Babel, and the story of Jonah, as though these had anything to do with him who said: "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die."

Jesus came into this world to give men truth, of course, but even more to give them life: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." One of his

greatest griefs was that "ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." Here, by the way, is an appeal from the Old Testament to himself. He had just said: "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life," and then he added: "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life"—stress the word "me." Life, is not that what the world needs, life that is "more than meat," and that "consisteth not in the abundance of things which he possesseth?" To think of Jesus as a dogmatist, is, it seems to me, to dishonor him, as far as that is possible. He was life and truth and light—"the power of God to salvation."

# VI

## FLEXIBILITY

It is probable that there is many a man who would not feel that he was complimented were he told that he had a flexible mind. Yet a mind the dominant characteristic of which was rigidity would hardly be a mind at all. As men have confused steadfastness to conviction with dogmatism, so they have taken flexibility as meaning yieldingness, and have thought of the flexible mind as the compromising mind. The error is grievous. Everything depends on the use that a man makes of his intellectual powers. A mind that is liberal, tolerant, forward-looking and forward-reaching, comprehensive and inclusive, as I have tried to show that the mind of Jesus was, could hardly help being flexible. If it were "set" it could not be inclusive and comprehensive.

To the extent that a mind is set and hardened, just to that extent is it small, powerful though it may be within the limitations under which it works. The flexibility of the mind of Jesus, one of its greatest qualities, was like that of a Damascus blade, and there is a "sword" that "reacheth unto the soul." For "the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." The fine blade, then, will serve very well as an illustration. It bends, but does not break, and "reacheth unto the soul." The blade is what it is—flexible, yet deadly in attack—because it is finely tempered. And so, surely, it was with the mind of Jesus. To say that it was flexible, is to say that it was superbly tempered and spiritually efficient in the highest degree. It never yielded in cases involving principle—there it was rigid. In truth it did not "yield" at all. But it did have a wonderful power of adapting itself to the work in hand, to the different temperaments of those with whom

it came in contact, to emergencies as they arose, and to varying conditions.

Jesus was born into a civilization that was, as far as we can judge, in both material and spiritual phases, fixed, rigid and static. Duties were prescribed in the minutest detail. The life of the people was overlaid by a network of law, and enmeshed in it. There were of course liberal leaders among the Jews, such men, for instance, as Gamaliel, Nicodemus, and the great rabbi, Hillel, whose writings Christians would do well to study.

But these men, and such as they, had little influence on the social and religious conditions of their day, which were rigid against change. Traditions were, without exception, held to be sacred, and naturally, for they were believed to be of divine origin, and backed by divine authority. Jesus sought to make them more flexible through the spiritualization of them. It was through the introduction of this very element of flexibility that men, as he thought, were to be freed. "The wind bloweth where it listeth," he said, "so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Long afterward, St. Paul expressed the same thought when he said that "the word of God is not bound."

Certain it is that Jesus handled great principles and truths in a free and fluid way, as they must be handled if they are to be made helpful to men. This could have been done only by a mind that was itself free and fluid in its method of operation. His work at first was one of adaptation—adaptation of the new to the old, or the old to the new. Jesus himself grew and developed, for we read that he "increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." That he was educated by experience we have the surest warrant for believing, for it is written: "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him."

If it be said that the proof of the flexibility of the mind of Jesus is largely negative, it must be admitted that that is true, but the proof is none the less strong. The mind was flexible because it was the opposite of what is not flexible. But

more than this, the quality seems to be a necessary inference from the character of the work that Jesus did, of the slight machinery which he used, of the doctrine which he taught, and of the organization which he established to spread it. That work was, in part, to shatter the rigidity of the old religious and social order. The machinery in the beginning was hardly that at all, consisting wholly as it did of personalities of widely different types of men. The doctrine, as I have endeavored to show, was undogmatic, and for all men—the emanation of his own divine personality. While the organization that he left behind him adapted itself easily to all sorts of men, recognizing "neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free."

The inmost spirit of Christ's Gospel is these words of St. Paul: "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, . . . that I might gain them that are without law. To the

weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. And this I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you."

A truly catholic religion must of necessity have this capacity of adapting itself to men of all classes, conditions, races, temperaments and stations in life, without, of course, yielding on essentials, which really are very few. It must, as the apostle said, be "made all things to all men" if it would "save some." There were no people whom Jesus met with whom it was not possible for him to establish intellectual relations, except the hypocrites, and even they understood much of what he said—often understood more than they were willing to admit.

One of the greatest dangers that threatens Christianity to-day is that of being hardened into a system, tradition-bound and inflexible. It can not suffer that fate except at the cost of losing what is an essential element in its life—that free, fine and flowing spirit which indeed is

its life. Yet some would convert it into a second Lazarus, "bound hand and foot with grave-clothes." The cry of Jesus at the tomb of Lazarus ought to penetrate the dullest ears: "Loose him, and let him go."

The Christian appeal is not to Moses, Noah or Joshua, but to Jesus Christ, the great progressive and emancipator, who labored and died to free the spirit of man, and give it full play in its search for truth, and its apprehension of it. It is written: "And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live." "This do, and thou shalt live"—that was all there was to it. The time may come when the churches will realize how guilty they have been in imposing on men any more than this as a matter of obliga-

tion, as "necessary to salvation." Even now it seems hard to believe that they could bring themselves, with their speculations and inferences, to go beyond their Master, as they all have done. To-day some seem disposed to hold that a man can not be a follower and disciple of Jesus unless he *disbelieves* in evolution.

What is supremely needed in these our days is the closest possible contact with the finely tempered mind of Jesus, with what Arnold called his "sweet reasonableness." Little of this is discernible in present-day religious life—a fact which explains much that is deplorable. Men deliberately refuse to pass from under the old schoolmaster—the law—to freedom under Jesus Christ. They are inflexible to the point of rigidity, and rigidity, in the spiritual world, is death. Perhaps those who are trying to free the soul thus bound have heard the voice of Jesus saying: "Loose him and let him go." Life is freedom, movement, constant adaptation—and flexibility.

# VII

## MENTAL APPROACH

As the mental approach of Jesus to men was natural, so the approach of his mind to the subjects with which he dealt and to the great problems of life was simple and direct. There are, and have been in the whole history of the race few of whom that can be said. For the most part men use their intellectual powers as though they were under the necessity of maintaining a case or upholding a theory, and they use everything that seems likely to contribute to those ends, rejecting all else. In their study of Jesus, to take one case, they begin with a pre-conception of what he is, or what they would like to believe him to be, and the result is often a portrait that exists only in the mind of the writer, bearing little resemblance to the original. Whether I have avoided this error is for others to say.

All I can say is that I have tried to keep clear of it.

But there are other distorting influences by which the minds of men are warped, often without their being aware of it. Inherited ideas, public opinion, education, the work in which a man is engaged, his associations, his race heritage, to say nothing of his fears and shirkings, all operate to cloud the vision, and to make straight, clear and courageous thinking exceedingly difficult. It must be said, and with sorrow, that men seek the truth as subordinate to something else, or with the reservation that some cause or leader be not harmed by its promulgation, and they are very ingenious in finding reasons—which are never the true ones—for their caution. On the whole, it is surprising that truth fares as well as it does.

Against all this the mind of Jesus was absolutely proof. It moved freely, directly and naturally toward its goal, which was, of course, the truth—truth about God and man. He thought the truth, he spoke the truth, he was the truth. From that supreme quest nothing could divert

him. It was his utter devotion to it that nailed him to the cross. Standing before Pilate, he said: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." All this stands out clearly on the face of the record, and concerning it there can be no dispute or difference of opinion.

But there is much that must be accounted for in another way. None of the distorting and warping influences that affect men operated in his case—that is clear. But it is perhaps not so clear that the inevitability and infallibility of his conclusions were due, in no small degree, to the quality of his mind, and it may be to one great quality in particular—its unsophistication. Perhaps it is not surprising that, in our wise age, there should be almost a contempt for that trait, but such seems to be the fact. This feeling may be due to a misunderstanding; if so, it is time the misunderstanding were cleared up.

We are much given to identifying wisdom with sophistication, and are disposed to think that nothing can be wise, deep or profound un-

less it is hard to understand. So men have refined and over-refined, defined things that can not be defined, and reasoned themselves into a mist in which the proportions and relations of objects are distorted out of all semblance to reality. Of these were many of the schoolmen, philosophers, theologians and metaphysicians who darken "counsel by words." All were truth-seekers, yet they often lost the truth in their very search for it, and rarely did they put it in such a way as to bring it within the comprehension of others.

Few things are more startling than the contrast between these minds and the mind of Jesus, which was direct, straightforward, simple in its operation, and finely unsophisticated. In others, the process often seems to be supreme over the mind—with him the mind was always supreme over the process. He never "spun clouds of fuzz where matter ends." When the officers sent by the Pharisees to arrest Jesus returned without him, and were asked why they had not brought him, they answered, we can imagine with a breathless awe: "Never man spake like

this man." "Truly," said the Roman soldier who stood at the foot of the cross, "this man was the Son of God." Certainly in the first case it was the mind of Jesus, as expressed in words, that stayed the hands and pierced the souls of the arresting officers, and it may have been so in the case of the soldier.

If it is true that the mind of Jesus was supreme over its processes, it is quite as true that he was supreme over his mind. It was his servant, and partook wholly of the nature and character of its Master, who said: "Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child he shall not enter therein." It may be said, as a sort of corollary, that what is praised in children is not, as many seem to think, their ignorance and unwisdom, but their innocence, trustfulness—and unsophistication. Nowhere are men bidden to receive the kingdom of God as ignoramuses. It is true, too, that the ignorant are often most unchildlike, and frequently very slyly sophisticated.

Jesus came most closely to those men and women who, if not innocent, at least worshipped

innocence in him, and craved it with a passionate longing for themselves. So his mental approach, both to the truth, and to those to whom he would impart it, was natural. The appeal is to his words, which no one can read without feeling that to be true.

It is, of course, true that the word "natural" has a bad meaning, as when St. Paul says: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Here the contrast is between natural and spiritual, and we have it again in the great argument of the apostle for immortality when he says: "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." There is no difficulty in understanding what he means. But the word "natural" also means "real" as opposed to what is artificial, and is used to describe a person who is truly himself, without pose or posturing. Few qualities are more charming and winning than such naturalness. It was eminent in Jesus, and one of the most distinctive traits of his mind. It is in no way surprising, therefore, that he should

have reacted violently—for him—against artificiality and pretense. These were sinful to him because they were unreal, vain, empty and unnatural.

In Keble's beautiful poem "Christmas Day" in his *Christian Year,* is the following stanza:

"Thee, on the bosom laid
Of a pure virgin mind,
In quiet ever, and in shade,
Shepherd and sage may find;
They, who have bow'd untaught to Nature's sway,
And they who follow Truth along her star-paved way."

It was "Nature's sway" that Jesus acknowledged, not merely physical nature, though even of that it will be recalled that Wordsworth said:

"Nature never did betray
The heart that loved her."

The mind of Jesus was in harmony with the universe as it left the hand of Almighty God, of which it is written that "God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good." His mind was in harmony also with his own di-

vine nature, its perfect expression. So it was that "shepherd and sage" were drawn to him, so it was that "the common people heard him gladly." They were, as we say, at home with him, and he with them. With none of the so-called graces of the orator, he yet spoke as never man spoke—directly, naturally, yet beautifully and with power, to the hearts and minds of men. "My words shall not pass away," he said. Most true it is. They are as vital as when first uttered, vital beyond any other words that have come down to us. The power of naturalness and simplicity—who can measure or weigh it?

The mental approach of Jesus is still being made and will continue to be made till the end of time. "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." It is the old approach, yet ever new, and lovingly and pathetically persistent.

# VIII

## POETICAL

THE mind of Jesus was in the highest degree poetical. The calamity resulting from the treatment and interpretation of it by theologians and logicians, creed-makers and system-builders, is pitifully revealed in the conditions now existing in the religious world. These men have dealt with metaphors as the premises of syllogisms, imagery as their conclusions, and have reduced the most divinely beautiful spiritual truths and principles to hard, inflexible and inadequate dogma. Even parables and miracles have been distorted to prove the truth of dogmas that had no existence until long after Jesus left the earth.

The sayings of Jesus are very largely made up of metaphors, similes, illustrations and allegories, and in their form they are often poetry of

the very highest order. "God," said Browning, "is the perfect poet." It is in no way surprising then that he should be incarnated in one who was also a poet. The mind of Jesus was not constructive except in a sense far different from that in which the word is for the most part used, and infinitely grander. It was constructive as the mind of the poet is, building for all time—and for eternity.

Jesus was not a philosopher, not primarily a moralist, but only because he was so much more and greater than either. He dealt with life from the inside, and with the hidden springs of action, as great poets always do. He left behind him only one institution as definitely established—the Holy Communion. Though in the accounts of it as given by St. Matthew and St. Mark there is no "do this" as indicating that the feast was to be of perpetual obligation, and though St. John makes no mention of its institution at the Last Supper in the upper room, it is nevertheless the great Christian feast, and as such has been celebrated for two thousand years.

But the point is that Jesus was not a system-

maker; he lived in another world from that inhabited by system-builders. He wrote not a line, as far as we know, except the words written in the sand when he was confronted by the woman taken in adultery, when the moralists in their pleasant way demanded that she be stoned. Here again, it may be noted parenthetically, Moses was overruled, and the law broken. "Moses in the law," said the moralists, "commanded that such be stoned; but what sayest thou?" After the lapse of nineteen hundred years it is easy enough to detect the contemptuous sneer in the words: "But what sayest thou?" Here is what he said: "Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more." What would we not give for that bit of writing in the sand! But we have many of the sayings of Jesus, and they are beautifully poetical. "The lilies of the field," "the fowls of the air," the grass, the fields white unto the harvest, the shepherds and their flocks, the sower, the desert to which Jesus retired for communion with himself and the Father—these were his frequent themes. The common things of life, the every day joys and sorrows, the hum-

ble duties, and the fate of cities and kingdoms were all handled poetically. It is not simply that Jesus spoke poetry, but that he had the mind of a poet, and looked at life from the poet's point of view.

It is doubtful whether there ever was a man who had in him anything of what we, for want of a better name, call insight, unless there was also in him something of the poetic quality. Of Jesus it is said that "he knew what was in man"—that is, he had the poet's insight, though a good deal more. He was therefore poles apart from the mere theologian, who is confessedly a religious scientist and nothing more, since theology is the science of religion. Some men are greatly alarmed over what they think to be the conflict between physical science and religion. Those who are thus disturbed are precisely the ones who need to give anxious thought to the very real conflict, which has been raging for centuries, and in the midst of which we are now living, between the science of religion and religion itself.

There are some people who think meanly of poetry, and to such it will seem almost impious

to speak of Jesus as a poet. Of some poetry it is well to think lightly—poetry that is mere prettiness, having nothing more than esthetic beauty. But poetry is also "the power that makes." The Bible is full of it. Poetry is prophecy, and prophecy, poetry. The claim of Jesus to a place in "the goodly fellowship of the prophets" is written deep in his own soul, which was, as was that of Isaiah, superbly and nobly poetical. The birth of Jesus was announced in song. The Magnificat and the Nunc Dimittis were inspired by the promise of his coming and his actual appearance in the flesh. The whole revelation throbs with beauty, and it is to its touching and ineffable loveliness that no small part of its power is due.

Jesus made even morality beautiful and poetic, and this was, when measured against the gloomy failure of many of his followers, one of his mightiest achievements. For much of Christian morality to-day is hard, unsympathetic, patronizing, mechanical, legalistic, an affair of rules and codes, and of statutes. There was nothing repellent—but everything beautiful—in

the morality of Jesus. His personality, life, and teaching, had a special charm for those whom we should condemn as bad people, and for little children. It was "the beauty of holiness" that won men and women and drew them to him. Yet commentators, theologians, metaphysicians, schoolmen and church councils have dealt with this wonderful life, and the things that cluster about it, and the poetry and beauty and glory that glow in it, and radiate from it, as logicians. As a result they have largely lost, and to some extent killed, the spirit through which alone Jesus can reach the hearts of sorrowing and sinning men. There is even a metaphysic of the Lord's Supper, the tenderest and sweetest—and most poetic—inheritance that we have from Jesus. In it there is every element of sublime yet tender poetry—association, fellowship with God and one another, memory, inspiration, prophecy, forgiveness, sacrifice, unity, and the marvelous spiritualization of the commonplace and material. Yet it is over this great and wonderful institution that men have quarreled and fought as over nothing else. It all comes of deal-

ing materialistically with profound spiritual truth, always and necessarily beauty as well as power. It is due to God's infinite mercy that there has been no greater wreck of faith than that from which the world has suffered.

Those who see in the teaching of Jesus little but poetry—and there are such—greatly err, but hardly more than those who see in it no or little poetry. The conflict between Jesus and the scribes was to a considerable extent between two types of mind, the poetical and the theologically scientific. There was an enormous difference between the two angles of approach. It could hardly be expected that a "regular" and a literalist would get much out of these words: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth." Yet Jesus said: "*So* is every one that is born of the Spirit." That was a startling, an inexplicable utterance to those who held and taught that the only ones born of the Spirit were those incorporated in a historic system, who lived by rule, and walked only so far on the Sabbath day. Even as en-

lightened and spiritually minded a man as Nicodemus was puzzled and perplexed. "How," he asked, "can these things be?"

Yet what is it all but the poetry of mystery, poetry teaching a lesson which it was never more important than now that men should take to heart? "*So* is every one that is born of the Spirit," free as the wind is free. As one can not tell whence the wind comes or whither it goes, though one does know it in action, it is quite as impossible to explain the new and spiritual birth, and wholly impossible to explain baptism, the fact of the new birth revealing itself in the life that follows it.

From that day to this the scribes and doctors have been busy with the religion of Jesus, and a sad muddle they have made of it. To say that the words just quoted, and much else of the teaching of Jesus, are poetry, will seem to some—perhaps to many—to say that they are not true, whereas it really is to say that they are beautifully, deeply and mysteriously true, and full of a meaning of which the doctors, Jewish and Christian alike, have never touched and never will touch even the fringes.

Matthew Arnold—who more than fifty years ago predicted the present crisis in the religious world—defined religion as "morality touched with emotion." Emotion, when put into speech or writing, is likely to take the form of poetry. "Think deeply enough," said Carlyle, "and you will think musically." No one ever thought as deeply as Jesus, and so no one ever thought as musically. Those who hold Jesus to be God ought surely to think of him as "the perfect poet, who in his own person acts his own creations." He was poetic both in his thought and in the expression of it. Frederick W. Faber, in his beautiful hymn, writes:

"Far, far away, like bells at evening pealing,
The voice of Jesus sounds o'er land and sea,
And laden souls by thousands meekly stealing,
Kind shepherd turn their weary steps to thee."

That voice has echoed down the centuries, bringing peace and rest, consolation and cheer and hope to "laden souls," and "ever calling us nearer to the true goal of all of us, to the ideal, to perfection,—to beauty, in a word, which is only truth seen from another side."

# IX

## SCIENTIFIC

If not scientific in its nature, the mind of Jesus was certainly scientific in its methods and ways of working. There is much more in common between the great and original scientist and the great poet than is sometimes supposed. In both the faculty of imagination is highly developed, though it may—yet this is by no means always true—operate in different fields in the two cases. But it is the same power whether working in the material or spiritual kingdom. Jesus spiritualized material things, while his very existence was a materialization of the spiritual. He was Lord of both worlds, and his imagination was at home in both of them—was scientific as well as poetical. He had the scientist's fine power of observation, which he used

with scientific exactness. While he did not "peep and botanize," never looked on nature as a subject for investigation and analysis, and was of course in no sense a physicist, he did use nature as the basis for much of his reasoning, and appealed to it as proof, not of a physical theory or law, but of the kindness and merciful providence of God. Jesus went through life observing, and drawing conclusions from his observations, and the conclusions were never forced or fanciful—they always followed naturally.

We do not often think of Jesus as a reasoner, but such he was, and of the highest type. He was scientific in the orderliness of his mental processes, in his ability to relate effect to cause, in his love for truth, his utter loyalty to it, and his pursuit of it. There are some who think of him as a sort of glorified revivalist and emotionalist, and even a fanatic. These utterly misapprehend him. His orderly mind moved with the sureness and precision of a cosmic force—which is what it was, and is. There was no one whom he met whom he did not out-reason. On

this basis alone his conclusions may be safely accepted and trusted. His religion is the reasonable religion of a reasonable being.

In nothing was Jesus more scientific than in his attitude toward traditions. He saw in them the cement that was necessary to hold society together and stabilize it, but he also understood that they might become so firm and set as to stifle growth and make progress impossible. This was precisely the attitude of a very acute student of society, the late Walter Bagehot. Nations, he pointed out, that did not have strongly developed customs could have no social order or stability. On the other hand, when those customs hardened into a "cake," the possibility of progress depended on the ability of society to break through the cake. The China of Mr. Bagehot's day could not do this, and so could not progress. It was enmeshed in customs to such an extent as to be imprisoned in them. Perhaps what we are now witnessing is a breaking of the "cake." Just so it is with traditions, which are inherited customs. Nothing could be more valuable—indeed indispensable—

up to a certain point, and nothing more fatal beyond that point.

Traditions, such seems to be the truth of the matter, may be good or bad in themselves, or good or bad as they have or have not outlived their usefulness. In the case of the Jews they must have been good in themselves, since they were believed to have been instituted by Jehovah. Yet they had become fetters. The scribes and Pharisees once asked Jesus: "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread." Here is the answer: "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? . . . Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition." That there was no quarrel with tradition as a social force is proved by the command of St. Peter and St. Paul to their followers to stand fast in the tradition delivered to them by the Apostles. The conclusion is—and it is strictly scientific—that no society or institution can live and be strong without traditions, or live and be strong and grow with traditions that

check growth, and "transgress the commandment of God." That clearly is the teaching of Jesus and his Apostles. It is also the teaching of all truly scientific sociologists.

Science is nothing more than ordered knowledge, and such was the knowledge of Jesus. Into such questions as to where he got it, the human limitations under which his mind worked and others of like character, I shall not go, for it is my wish to keep clear of metaphysics, speculation and theology. It is with the knowledge that he had, whatever its source, that we now have to do. That he was conscious of living in a developing universe there can, I think, be no doubt. To him growth was a self-evident fact—growth both in the material and the spiritual universe. And the growth was orderly, never catastrophic. "So is the kingdom of God," he said, "as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. *For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself;* first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." Again he said that the

kingdom of God "is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that be in the earth: but when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches; so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it." Always there is this idea of small and simple beginnings flowering into a large and complex life. *So* is the kingdom of God, and so are the kingdoms of this world, material and moral.

Life, as Jesus saw it, was progress from lower to higher, and its goal was the highest, that is perfection. Life that is not a growing, developing and expanding force or power, is only death under another name. The kingdom of God was to be an inward influence, as leaven in meal, and it was this inner nature of man that Jesus sought to strengthen and enrich, seeing in it the germ or cell in which the spiritual life originated. Looking backward, he saw progress in the apprehension of spiritual truth, and progress in the revelation of Almighty God, and looking forward, he saw "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming

down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." Browning, interpreting St. John, writes:

I say that man was made to grow, not stop;
That help, he needed once, and needs no more,
Having grown but an inch by, is withdrawn;
For he hath new needs, and new helps to these.
This imports solely, man should mount on each
New height in view; the help whereby he mounts,
The ladder-rung his foot has left, may fall,
Since all things suffer change save God the Truth.
Man apprehends him newly at each stage
Whereat earth's ladder drops, its service done.

Man is not God but hath God's end to serve,
A master to obey, a course to take,
Somewhat to cast off, somewhat to become.
Grant this, that man must pass from old to new,
From vain to real, from mistake to fact,
From what once seemed good, to what now proves best.
How could man have progression otherwise?

Life, to Jesus, was a becoming. It needed a favorable environment which he labored and died to give it. There never was such a passing from old to new as that which he brought, never such a throwing down of "earth's ladder," never such

a moving forward "from what once seemed good, to what now proves best." St. Paul expressed the same thought when he said: "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ."

Everything is in motion, and should be and was meant to be in motion from lower to higher. There are schoolmasters to-day, as there were in St. Paul's day, who may have served their purpose—no doubt an excellent one—beyond whom it may now be necessary to pass if we are to be "the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ." Indeed there are those who firmly and reverently believe that Jesus is even now calling them to something better and higher and truer than the schoolmasters—or some of them—are giving. It is by no means improbable that the call, which is stirring so many hearts in these days, comes from him.

But it is still to be inquired what use Jesus made of the scientific method, and to what sub-

jects it was chiefly applied. Perhaps it may all be summed up in the statement that it was used exclusively in that field in which it is most needed in our time, and is least used—the spiritual realm. Like all science, the science of Jesus was based on facts and knowledge, and the knowledge was two-fold—knowledge of God and of man. "As my Father hath taught me," he said, "I speak these things." Again he said: "Ye have not known him; but I know him: and if I should say, I know him not, I shall be a liar like unto you: but I know him, and keep his saying." In everything that he did or said he revealed the completest knowledge of man—of his inmost soul. To this knowledge St. John testifies: "Now when he was in Jerusalem at the Passover, in the feast day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself to them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man." It was on the foundation of science or ordered knowledge that he built, and from that knowledge that his conclusions and inferences

were drawn. He did not attempt to solve a problem until he had mastered it and thoroughly familiarized himself with the factors that entered into it. He came to earth to satisfy the deepest needs of men, and no one can say that the means he employed were not perfectly adapted to that end. There is every reason why there should be order in a man's religious thinking, as there was in the thinking of Jesus. The spiritual kingdom is a kingdom of law, not of whim or mere fancy.

Again Jesus was in line with the truest science when he refused to promulgate any distinctly social program—as he most assuredly refrained from doing—for he touched society and sought to influence it through the individual. He taught that the individual was, with the help of God, to save himself by making himself the best man possible, and that through that salvation social salvation could only come. His effort was to transform the relations between men by transforming men, and thus to transform society. Unless there is the first transformation the second is impossible.

It is generally agreed that Jesus founded a

church, but his greatest contribution to human thought is his saying that "the kingdom of God is within you." The external kingdom—the church—is weak only because the internal kingdom has not been born in the hearts of all its members. Growth from the inner to the outer, from the seed to the blossom and fruit—such is the law in the spiritual as in the material world, and it is a scientific law. Evolution is written on almost every page of the Bible, and the only choice open to men is between evolution and reversion or degeneration.

# X

## THE HIGHER LOGIC

THERE is, and always has been, a disposition to undervalue logic and even to sneer at it. Carlyle's impatience with it and scorn of it are well-known. Yet he, and most of the other depreciators, were themselves logical. It would be absurd to think of them as belittling reason and discouraging the use of it, for that they never did, and reason that is not logical is not reason at all. But such men held that there was a knowledge unattainable by the unaided intellectual faculties. The universe was, in their thought, fundamentally spiritual, and they felt that it was the chief business of man to try to discover the laws that governed it, and to live in accordance with them. In this great realm, formal logic, as they believed, could have little place—was al-

most an intruder. So it was necessary to limit it to its proper sphere. But Carlyle went even further, and insisted that even within that sphere the function of logic was less important than was generally supposed. It may at least be said that it reveals little—for the conclusion can contain nothing that is not in the premises—and is a defective instrument for the acquisition of knowledge. One may reason with perfect accuracy from premise to conclusion, but the conclusion would be worth nothing if the premises were false.

But there is a higher logic, and of this the mind of Jesus was master. While he was both a revelation and the recipient of a revelation, his reason seemed to penetrate back of the premises from which the conclusion was drawn, those premises themselves being conclusions from antecedent knowledge and truth. He reasoned from facts that were facts, and from principles that were true beyond dispute. The mere logician is chiefly concerned with the process, with that rather than the result. Jesus, on the other hand, cared for nothing but the result. Let us take an

illustration. Once speaking to the Jews he said: "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." Here is a complete, an almost formal syllogism. But what lies back of it? Clearly the conviction on the part of the speaker that his words were God's words, and that in refusing to hear them the Jews were rejecting the words of God, and therefore were not of God. The major premise, therefore, was, not "he that is of God heareth God's words"—it was his own divinity together with his consciousness of it. This great and overwhelming truth was the foundation of his argument.

As a contrast, take this specimen of popular reasoning: Men ought to hear and obey the word of God; the Bible is the word of God; therefore men ought to rule and govern their life and thought and belief in every detail by the Bible. There is nothing wrong with that as a syllogism. The trouble is with the minor premise—the Bible is the word of God. For the Bible is not the only word of God, nor is all of it the word of God. This was recognized almost

four hundred years ago by the framers of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. In Article VII is this: "Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from obedience of the commandments which are called moral." It is inconceivable that Jesus could have made the mistake against which the Anglican divines sought to guard. Those, he said, were of God, who heard God's words, which were at the very moment being spoken by Jesus himself, who was the eternal Word.

Much harm has been done by the mechanical use of logic in religion—much harm is being done to-day. It was no doubt of this result that Carlyle and the others were thinking. Whole systems of theology, elaborate, complicated and inflexible, have been built up, systems resting on premises that are themselves foundationless. The logical process was as a rule sound as a process, for the men using it were mostly mas-

terly logicians, but it did not go back far enough, did not penetrate into and draw from the ultimate truth which includes and embraces everything. Hence the edifice was bound to fall, and is to-day, before our very eyes, tumbling into ruin. So there is a higher logic, of which, as has been said, Jesus was master. His great aim was, not to prove, but to proclaim and reveal. Indeed he almost seems deliberately to have withheld formal proof both of his doctrine and mission.

When John the Baptist, through two of his disciples, asked: "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" Jesus did not appeal to the prophecies, or point to himself as their fulfillment, or support his claim by argument, but said: "Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me." That is, Jesus was the Saviour or Messiah because, even while St. John was doubting and questioning, he was saving men, as

his deeds proved. Such was the logic of Jesus, and it was conclusive because it was based on realities, both material and spiritual. "Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see"—there was the proof. What he had done and was every day doing demonstrated his Messiahship. "I am the Messiah," he in effect says, "because I am doing the work and performing the functions of the Messiah."

By this method, and this method only, can the existence of God and his relation to human affairs and human history, be proved. Before such a problem the ordinary logic, the logic of those who are merely logicians, breaks down. The great mistake that men have ever made, and are making to-day, is in relying on it and using it in a sphere to which it does not belong and can not be made to apply. It was this employment of it that stirred Carlyle's scorn, as it well may have done. We may indeed say that Jesus was not a logician and did not use logic. Yet with his great, profound, orderly and keen mind, it is impossible that he should have thought illogically. Is it not nearer the truth to say that he al-

ways saw a premise behind the two premises of the syllogism—God and truth, or God the truth? The conclusion then seems to be that men—certainly Christians—should begin with Jesus as the starting point of their reasoning, make him their major premise.

The first disciples, those who associated intimately with Jesus, were as perplexed and puzzled as men are to-day. In one of his last talks with them Jesus said: "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also. And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know." But St. Thomas asked the old question, the question which men have been asking from the dawn of religious consciousness, and are still asking: "Lord, we know not whither thou goest: and how can we know the way?" The answer is for all time: "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also; and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him." But still the disciples were

not satisfied, did not understand, for St. Philip said: "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." Then followed this exposition: "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me."

If we are to treat Christianity logically, we must begin with Jesus—and end with him. Such is the clear teaching of St. Paul, who spoke of Jesus Christ as "the image of God," and said: "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

There can be no objection to the efforts to humanize Jesus in order to make him real, for he

was "perfect man." The theologians and metaphysicians have done much to make him unreal. "We have not," it is written, "an high priest which can not be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Friend, helper, companion, servant, elder brother—all these he was. Yet we are now thinking of logic, and that requires that a system, revelation, or religion should be consistent with itself. Nothing could be more inconsistent with itself than a Christianity that rested solely in and on the humanity of Jesus. For it is a religion of reconciliation, and the whole point to it is that God and man meet and are reconciled in Jesus Christ, and that in and through him humanity is raised to and becomes partaker in the divine nature. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father"—that is the conclusion of the whole matter. Christianity, if it is to be divinely logical, must become more and more Christo-centric. Those who are still asking with St. Thomas—and there are many such—"Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?" should reverently

and humbly accept the answer: "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and henceforth ye know Him and have seen Him."

# XI

## REALITIES

It has been said that the logical systems of theology that have been so carefully built up are toppling to their ruin. It could not be otherwise, for they are most unreal, and men in increasing numbers are beginning to feel this. They are unreal because unrelated to life, or to the great truths revealed by Jesus. His intellectual interest was in realities—God, the soul, life, death, immortality, character, redemption and salvation, faith, truth, sin, sacrifice, righteousness, to mention only a few of them. He fed, and still feeds, both the bodies and souls of men. Man, in his sight, was essentially a soul. Perhaps, next to God, he ranked the human soul as the great reality. Men have, to their shame be it said, taken very lightly these great, solemn and most true words; "For whosoever will save

his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Greater than life itself, greater than the whole world, is the soul of man.

Immediately after his baptism Jesus faced the temptation to which men all about us are yielding every day. Here is the account of probably the most subtle of the temptations, the temptation to bargain for power: "Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." When, therefore, he asked: "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"—he spoke out of a deep and terrible personal experience. The soul, thus, is real, and "the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them" are not.

Whitman, whom we do not sufficiently honor as a spiritual force and teacher, though he was pre-eminently both, said: "It is undeniable that our farms, offices, dry-goods, coal and groceries, enginery, cash accounts, trades, earnings, markets, etc., should be attended to in earnest, and actively pursued, *just as if they had a real and permanent existence,*" as—such is the inference—they had, and have not. With him, too, the soul was the great reality. It is for that reason that there can be no more frightfully debasing traffic than that in souls—as there is none more common. In the wilderness the battle for Christian idealism—which is the only true realism—was fought and won.

Jesus did not scorn the material—on the contrary, he used it and transformed and glorified it. Nothing is more real or material than bread, wine and water, but when touched and blessed by him they were invested with divine attributes and powers. The only real things are those that last, and of these there are only two, God and the soul—"Earth changes, but thy soul and God stand sure." Jesus was, however, no mystic, ex-

cept in the sense that he dealt with mysteries, and what is there in the life of man that is not a mystery? Godliness itself is, according to the apostle.

Jesus never saw mysteries where they did not exist, but always sought to explain and make clear those which he and others were—as we still are—called on to face. He was a reconciler in more ways than one, and his great problem was to reconcile the spiritual and the material, the real and the ideal. Though this latter antithesis is a false one it yet serves to indicate the popular feeling with reference to the two. The reconciliation, according to his teaching, was to be effected through the domination of the Spirit of God, through the permeation of life by that Spirit. Things that were realities to men were realities to Jesus—pain, sickness, sin, suffering, as well as their contraries.

It was with these, and such as these that he was mostly concerned, as we see in his sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth. The spiritual world was not to him a realm of spectres and shadows, but was rather a world in which men might, and

were meant to live, on this earth. It was the kingdom of God, and nothing to him was more real than that. The spiritual world was in truth the material world redeemed, transformed and glorified.

This is the very foundation thought of Jesus, for it is involved in the Incarnation—indeed is the Incarnation. The great truth, in spite of the efforts of the wise men since his day, has never been so well formulated as by St. Paul: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation: to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." The Incarnation is the deification of matter through the using of a material body for the purpose of revealing divine truth—of showing God to men. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

But men find it difficult to think of the spiritual as real, and for that reason they have always been disposed to set off one against the other.

So the demonstration by and through the Incarnation was necessary. Men have also been much given to thinking of the material as the only reality, and as a result we have our grossly material religions—materialism itself has become a sort of religion.

It was because of this human weakness in failing to recognize the difference between the spiritual and the material that the disciples so often failed to understand Jesus. After he had fed the four thousand, he and the disciples "entering into the ship again departed to the other side. Now the disciples had forgotten to take bread, neither had they in the ship with them more than one loaf. And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of Herod. And they reasoned among themselves, saying, It is because we have no bread." Dullness, it would seem, could hardly go further. Yet it is pathetically human. The poor men related "the leaven of the Pharisees" to material bread. Surely there is a note of despair in the patient explanation of Jesus: "Why reason ye, because ye have no bread?

perceive ye not yet, neither understand? have ye your heart yet hardened? Having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember? When I brake the loaves among five thousand, how many baskets full of fragments took ye up? They say unto him, Twelve. And when the seven among four thousand, how many baskets full of fragments took ye up? And they said, Seven. And he said unto them, How is it that ye do not understand?" So St. Mark records the incident.

St. Matthew is more explicit, his account concluding thus: "How is it that ye do not understand that I spake it not unto you concerning bread, that you should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees." The question of bread would take care of himself, as he had just proved. Yet it was of that alone that the disciples were thinking.

It is perhaps not surprising that the woman of Samaria, with whom Jesus talked by Jacob's

7659



well, should have utterly misapprehended the teaching of Jesus, but her mistake was so human that it may be well to dwell on it as a specimen of a very widespread and stupid materialism. Having asked for a drink of water, she having come thither to draw, Jesus said: "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water." "Sir," the woman answered, "thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep; from whence then hast thou that living water?" There it is, the old mistake repeated from generation to generation. Jesus answered more explicitly: "Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again: But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." But all that the woman sought was to be freed from the necessity of coming to the well for water. "Sir," she said, "give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw."

The disciples, who had gone to the neighboring

93

city to buy meat, were quite as dull and blind. Returning, they said: "Master, eat." His words, "I have meat to eat that ye know not of," brought the following query: "Hath any man brought him ought to eat?" Jesus answered: "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me." But the crucial example in the treatment of the Eucharist, and the instruction leading up to it. When Jesus said that he was "the living bread," and that this bread was his flesh, which he would "give for the life of the world" the Jews asked: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" After he had amplified the teaching in great detail, and emphasized the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood as essential to eternal life, even his disciples said: "This is an hard saying: who can hear it?" And so it is recorded, "from that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him."

This affords no special cause for wonder, but it is remarkable that, full in the face of the explanation of Jesus, many Christians still take the old materialistic view. The explanation is as follows: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the

flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." What was taught was the need for the closest and most intimate spiritual association and communion with himself. "The flesh," in the sacrament, or anywhere else, "profiteth nothing."

In all these instances there was a gross materialization of spiritual truth, for only so could it be real to the materializers. In the concluding part of his talk with the woman Jesus made it all clear: "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." The great reality is the spiritual life, the life of the soul, and nothing can be more beautiful. Religion, dealing as it does with material beings and things, must be material, but when it becomes materialistic, it is an offense in the sight of God. The spiritual and the material were both real to Jesus, and he brought them into the right relation, not by debasing the spirit-

ual but by exalting the material. It was a wonderful achievement, for nothing could be more difficult. Man hovers between the two, inclining mostly to the material. In the universe of God there is nothing more unreal than the material as it is for the most part conceived by men. The teaching of Jesus may be summed up in a very few words: "Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness."

# XII

## MYSTERIES AND MYSTICISM

THOUGH Jesus of necessity dealt with mysteries, spoke of "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven," and created a mystery when he instituted the Eucharist, his mind was not that of a mystic. Indeed the word mystery is used not more than three or four times in the Gospels—more often in the Epistles, which is what we should expect, for mysteries multiply the further in time we get away from Jesus, and the more we labor to explain him. In his great prayer for his disciples shortly before his crucifixion, Jesus said: "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. Sanctify them through thy truth: thy

word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." Neither he nor they were of the world, but they were in the world, and it was in the world that their work was to be done. And the prayer for the disciples was "not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil."

Jesus himself never withdrew from the ordinary life of men and women except for brief intervals of rest, prayer and communion with God, in order that he might return to his mission strengthened and refreshed—as from the Mount of Transfiguration. What he sought was contact with man, with his joys and sorrows, his needs and his sins. His mind never fed on itself, as that of the mystic so often does, and it did not value solitude and isolation for their own sake, as having any value in themselves. I would be the last to depreciate the great mystics, for to them we owe much that is beautiful and helpful—I only insist that Jesus was not of their company.

The mind of Jesus was intensely practical in

the noblest sense of that greatly abused word, for it was always bent to the performance of the mission which he believed to be his. Little time was given even to contemplation, the great food of the mystic—would that there were more of it!—for he was too busy caring for and helping others, and his problem always was how best to do it. His time, except for a few brief intervals, was constantly at the disposal of others, and his path through life was thronged by the multitude. The mind of such a person must needs have been practical—and unmystical. It was the mind of one who knew what work was, both physical and intellectual. Pondering its depth, one must be amazed at its fine simplicity and wonderful directness. Herein he differs from the philosophers. There are minds that are chiefly interested in themselves, and this is natural, for the mind is a marvelous instrument. But we owe little to such men in the way of service.

Jesus used his intellectual powers, as he did all the faculties of his nature, for the benefit of others, and to accomplish a very definite purpose. So there was a perfect adaptation of the mind to

the work in hand. Nothing could be more clear, positive and definite than the Sermon on the Mount. Men may argue about it as a rule of life, of the difficulty of realizing it to the full, but no one can be under any misapprehension as to what the rule of life is. We have in that sermon a catalogue of duties, beautifully expressed, and proclaimed and imposed with power. "He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes."

In nothing is mental penetration shown more clearly than in his attitude toward sin. It is a mistake to think that his mind played little or no part here, for it played a very great part. He saw sin for what it was, not as mere wrong doing, but as a taint of the soul. "He knew what was in man"—it is the mind that knows. He saw saints—or the possibility of them—in those whom the world counted sinners, and sinners in those who counted themselves saints. The greatest sin in his eyes was hypocrisy, and he was unerring in the detection of it.

The late Bishop Hugh Miller Thompson once said in a sermon that has lingered in my memory

for more than thirty years, that it was a very remarkable fact that when Jesus entered a town he so often associated with people who were not "respectable"—and it was so. He was drawn to them for two reasons, both very practical. In the first place, the tax gatherers and harlots knew what they were, and did not pretend to be other than they were. So in his shrinking from pretense Jesus was drawn to those who did not pretend. In the second place, these people, when they came into contact with him, felt their need, and cried out for relief. On the other hand, the "respectable" people, like the church of Laodicea, thought that they were "rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing," and did not know that they were "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind and naked."

St. Luke gives a beautiful account of a meeting between Jesus on the one hand, and a Pharisee and a sinful woman on the other: "And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat with him. And he went into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat. And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she

knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment, and stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment. Now when the Pharisee which had bidden him saw it, he spake within himself saying, This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him: for she is a sinner." He did not know that, in the eyes of Jesus, he, too, was a sinner, as all men were, and are sinners, and that was his trouble.

But the story goes on: "And Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee. And he saith, Master, say on. There was a certain creditor which had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me, therefore, which of them will love him most? Simon answered, I suppose that he, to whom he forgave most. And he said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged. And he turned to the woman, and said unto Si-

mon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head. Thou gavest me no kiss; but this woman, since the time I came in hath not ceased to kiss my feet. My head with oil thou didst not anoint; but this woman hath anointed my feet with ointment. Wherefore, I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much; but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little. And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven."

Yet after all this "they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves, Who is this that forgiveth sins also?" The chapter closes with a blessing to the woman: "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." The judgment was on its face just, the product of straight and clear thinking, as well as of a divinely tender feeling. It was recognized that Simon was much less of a sinner than the woman—less, in the proportion of fifty to five hundred pence. The faith and love of the woman were proved, and where faith and love are salvation can not be far off. What

is to be noted—and emphasized—is that Jesus was intellectually, as well as morally and spiritually, right.

It is true that we must look for sin beyond the outward act, though it is only with the outward act that human justice can, as a rule, reckon. In all cases the mind of Jesus saw through, to the bottom of, and all round every subject that was presented, or that presented itself to him, and his judgment was based on indisputable facts. True it is that his mind was divinely illumined, but so may every man's mind be, if he will but have it so, by "the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." No, Jesus was no mystic, but rather an active co-worker with men and women in their own redemption.

# XIII

## ORIENTAL?

If the Orient, considered spiritually, were a fixed and clearly defined region it would be a comparatively easy task to determine whether the mind of Jesus was, as many think, oriental in its character. But as there is no clearly defined Orient, except perhaps geographically, the problem is one of much difficulty. China and India are both oriental countries, and yet they differ totally in their religions and in their attitude toward things of the spirit. Probably it is the religion of India, with its brooding mysticism and poetic exaggerations, that men have in mind when they attempt to decide whether Jesus was an oriental. Let us assume that this is the case.

It is certain that the people among whom Jesus was born were a very practical people,

practical even in their religious life. They had their mysteries, to be sure, but religion to them was primarily a matter of conduct. They had a very slight hold on the doctrine of immortality, and as late as the time of Jesus there were many who disbelieved in it. There was in the Hebrews a strong tendency to lapse into materialism in their religion, a materialism against which the prophets waged relentless warfare. The religious life of the time of Jesus was in many of its aspects nobly practical and finely moral. If it was—as it certainly was—in many things mechanically moral, that fact only serves to show how far it was removed from what we have agreed to call orientalism. It was much more concerned with this world, its duties and rewards, than with the world to come. Earthly rewards were invariably attached to right action—"honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." Few maxims are entirely true, yet Bacon was not far wrong when he said: "Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament: adversity is the blessing of the New." The

Jews looked for an earthly Messiah and earthly dominion. In all this there is little to suggest Buddhism. From Buddhism the religion of Israel, both at its best and its worst, was separated by a wide interval.

Such was the environment and heritage of Jesus. If he revolted against both, it was not in the direction of the contemplative religions of the east, but toward a life of active beneficence. Life to him was indeed mysterious, for it was, as he taught, pre-eminently spiritual. His great aim was to make the spiritual real—to show that it was the great reality. But any one who believes in God at all must believe that, for God is a spirit, and the great reality.

The mind of Jesus contemplated life as something not to be brooded over, but to be lived. He labored to establish right relations among men, and this could not be done by withdrawing from such relations—which he never did. I can see nothing of orientalism in the mind of Jesus or in the religion which he preached and lived. The religion was simple, and its appeal was to simple folk, and not to the elect. One has only to read

the sermon of Jesus, to which reference has been made, in the synagogue at Nazareth to be convinced of the blessedly practical nature of his mission. The words are those of Isaiah which, in that sermon, Jesus applied to himself: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." Whether this religion would at that time have been adapted to the East, and received by it, we can not say, for it was not presented to the East, unless we accept the tradition of St. Thomas's mission to India, of which a very ancient church on the Malabar Coast was supposed to be the fruit.

The apostles turned immediately to the West. There were many reasons that influenced them. The great Roman roads invited, and many of the regions penetrated by the Christian missionaries were easily accessible from the sea. Latin and

Greek were the languages of the western world, and thus there was a common speech. The great Roman peace was a further factor in the decision, and a most important one. St. Paul, the greatest missionary of them all, was himself a Roman citizen. There was an easy and natural contact, commercial and otherwise, between the Holy Land and the western world. Finally the old religions and the old *mores* were breaking down, so that the time was ripe for this new call to the spirit of man. St. Paul believed that he had been divinely forbidden to go eastward, divinely called into Europe, as is made clear in the book of Acts of the Apostles. "Forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia," it is written that "a vision appeared to Paul in the night: There stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help us. And after he had seen the vision, immediately we endeavored to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us for to preach the gospel unto them."

But after giving full weight to these reasons, and it is very great, it is yet true that this sup-

posedly oriental religion made its great conquests in the West, and it must have been felt that it was especially adapted to western needs, and such proved to be the case. There were hardships to be overcome, perils to be faced, persecutions to be endured, and cruel deaths to die—the battle was no easy one—but there are few things in history more amazing than the spread of Christianity in the first three hundred years of its life.

Within forty years after the death of St. Paul, Pliny, governor of Bithynia, writing to the Emperor Trajan as to the right method to use in dealing with Christians, speaks of Christianity as a "contagious superstition" that "is not confined to the cities only, but has spread its infection among the neighboring villages and country." "The temples," Pliny continues. "which were almost deserted, begin now to be frequented." One can not believe that the religion of Jesus could have made any such headway in the East. It is, it may be said, only just now getting a start.

In order to be perfectly fair, one must admit that the adaptation was not all on one side. For

though Christianity modified the life of the people to whom it came, it was itself modified, and very considerably, by that life and through contact with it. The new religion absorbed something of Greek philosophy. Many of the Egyptian and Roman mysteries were taken into it. Later it became imperialistic after the Roman pattern. Here is another proof of the flexibility of the new faith, as of the mind of its Founder. The fact that a working agreement was so easily established is pretty good proof that it was spiritually of kin to the West rather than to the East, and that the mind of its author was not oriental.

It would be a great mistake, and very foolish to hold that Christianity is fitted only for western peoples. Rather, it is a universal religion. The mind of Jesus too was neither occidental nor oriental, but universal. It derived its truth from two sources—experience of life, and that God who is "the Lord of all the earth." The needs that he would meet and fully satisfy are the needs of universal man. It is the high calling of all who accept his leadership and love their fel-

lowmen to co-operate with him in the divine work of relieving those needs, which are sore. He carried on his heart the woes of all men. And his great representative, the reborn Saul of Tarsus, said "God that made the world and all things therein . . . and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." The mind of Jesus was not oriental or occidental, but divinely human, or humanly divine. A happy day will it be for the world when it is supreme in human affairs, when "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ." His mind is the mind of the new head of the race—of all the race.

# XIV

## CONTRADICTORIES?

WERE there contradictions in the mind of Jesus? Certainly one can not fail to note what seem to be such. No nobler pride can be imagined than that showed by him when he confronted the Jews with the tremendous declaration: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am." The same great quality was shown when Jesus stood calm and unmoved before Pilate, not deigning to answer to the charge, "so that Pilate marveled." On the other hand, Jesus is the eternal pattern of humility, preaching it as one of the great Christian virtues. "He that is greatest among you," he said, "shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." Not only so, but he enforced

his teaching on this subject by his own example, as when, on the last night of his earthly life, he washed the feet of his disciples, saying: "Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done."

Such was what seems to have been his two-fold view of life, and of his relation to it. The contradiction, however, is wholly on the surface. It is only the man who is rightfully proud—and without sin—who can show humility. In this supposed act of humiliation Jesus preached the ever-precious doctrine of *noblesse oblige*—the higher the rank and the greater the power, the greater the responsibility. "Lord and Master" he was, but his mission was service. He did not condescend to it, and was not conscious of having lost any of his glory, for his glory was to do the will of his Father. There is here then no contradiction.

Jesus was wholly without intellectual pride—

of that there is not a trace in anything that he said or did. His mind was too great to be the victim of that infirmity. We sometimes wonder whether genuinely great men know themselves to be great—are conscious of their greatness. I think it may be said that the greater they are the less likely will they be disturbed by any thoughts at all of self. Certainly this was the case with Jesus. Such pride and humility as he had and showed were natural allies, supplementing and reinforcing each other.

The sweep of his mind between the two extremes—humility and a divine pride—is thus indicated by St. Paul: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

All through his life St. Paul had to struggle against intellectual pride, and he did not always

win the victory, though he made a brave, and for the most part, a successful fight. No man was ever more deeply conscious of his infirmities—this one among them. He learned his lesson, and so he could say: "I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound." But there was no such problem in the life of Jesus, for he was, as has been said, the incarnation of a ministering and suffering God. "He that is greatest among you shall be your servant." Thus what seem to be contradictions are reconciled.

It was just so with the relation of Jesus to the common life of man. He was, as I have tried to show, no mystic. Nor was he an ascetic. Exalting the things of the spirit as alone of importance, and utterly careless in regard to those matters with which men are mostly concerned—houses, lands, food, raiment, and the rest—and almost scornful in what he had to say about wealth, Jesus lived the life of his time, mingled with others, enjoyed human contacts, and saw nothing wrong in innocent pleasures, holding as innocent some pleasures which are to-day crimes. Indeed, he was severely criticised by the strait-

laced people of his day, as he himself tells us: "John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." What he did would, if done to-day, subject a man to fine and possibly imprisonment. As he was no mystic, so he was no ascetic—and yet he lived in the spirit as no ascetic ever did. He never lost "the common touch." On the contrary, it was through that touch, as has been suggested, that he redeemed, glorified and spiritualized common things and the common and material life. Asceticism always has in it something of the self-conscious, and in its extreme form is always non-natural.

Again, there was no contradiction in the mind of Jesus—what we have rather is another reconciliation, that between man's ordinary daily life and the spiritual life to which he is called, between the natural and the supernatural. The approach of Jesus to men, to their joys and sorrows, was always itself natural, and never conventional. He never saw wrong where none ex-

isted, and never condemned, as wrong, things that were at least indifferent. He fasted, and sometimes withdrew from the crowded ways, as the ascetics do, but unlike them he "came eating and drinking," and "yet," as he must have thought, "without sin." His morality was a real morality; never conventional, mechanical, law-made.

There are those who think that a man can not be spiritual unless he shows it by outward mien, by the expression of his countenance, or by some act in accordance with certain conceptions of right and wrong which may have no foundation in reality. Against this Jesus protested both by his life and doctrine. "Moreover," he said, "when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly." Such was his rule of life in this very important matter. What he warned against—

and the warning is still needed—was professional piety. The spiritual man is not he who thinks he is spiritual, not he who may be thought by others to be spiritual, but rather the man who has a right sense of values, and who lives, or tries to live, "as seeing Him who is invisible."

In all this it is clear that the mind of Jesus was at one with itself, and at one with his Father. His mind was both natural and supernatural, and thus it was that he was able to make the supernatural seem natural, as it ought to be, and must be, if men are ever to establish any fruitful contact with it—ever to enter into it, rise above themselves, and "be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," that "liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."

Great minds always seem to small minds to be self-contradictory, and it has been so with the mind of Jesus. Matthew Arnold was right when he said that Jesus was "over the heads of his reporters"—indeed, it could not have been otherwise. The difficulty of understanding him is due to his greatness—the greatness of his mind.

Yet there is another side to it all, happily for humanity. For that very greatness, before which one can only stand in awe and reverence, and sometimes with a sense of bewilderment, made it possible for him to bring wonderful and divine mysteries within the comprehension of the simplest, and to enter into and mould and sway the life of twenty centuries. St. Paul asked: "For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him?" No one, surely, and yet the apostle adds: "We have the mind of Christ." All may, at least if they will, learn something of its working—and catch something of its temper.

# XV

## KEENNESS

One can not speak of the greatness and power of the mind of Jesus without seeming to subject him to the patronage of eulogy, and of that there has been far too much. So let us take these for granted. But it may be said that he used his wonderful intellectual equipment in a marvelously effective way to persuade his disciples—and to make disciples—and to confound his enemies.

If the word shrewdness had not acquired a sinister meaning, and were not thought of as almost synonymous with slyness, it might be used—may it not be used without offense?—to characterize the dealings of Jesus with his foes, as when in the seventh chapter of St. John's Gospel his arguments set his hearers against one another, and

in his answer to those who asked him whether it was lawful to pay tribute unto Cæsar.

And so of his reply to those who pretended to be so greatly concerned over the marital relations in heaven of a supposed woman who on earth had had seven husbands from all of whom she had been parted by death. On one occasion the chief priests and elders asked him: "By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?" Here is the answer: "I also will ask you one thing, which, if ye tell me, I in likewise will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him? But if we shall say, Of men; we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet. And they answered Jesus, and said, We can not tell. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things." That it was not a mere battle of wits—though it was largely that—is proved by the teaching that immediately followed.

For, after having silenced his foes, Jesus said: "But what think ye? A certain man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to-day in my vineyard. He answered and said, I will not: but afterward he repented, and went. And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir: and went not. Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say unto him, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him." Here, after all, is the answer to the question as to authority—not solely John's, but all authority. John "came unto you in the way of righteousness"—that was his authority, and it was sufficient.

There is another moral to be drawn from the incident. While we have had in another passage a condemnation of those who "say, and do not,"

here we have praise for those who "say not," but "do." The teaching plainly is that professing Christians—those who say "I go," and go not—are rejected, while those who are not formally Christians and yet live the good life, are accepted as members of the kingdom of God. As a matter of fact, Jesus had little interest in this question of authority. He inferred authority, and would have men infer it, from acts. When charged with casting out devils through satanic agency, he said: "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." The source of the power was proved by its beneficent and mighty operation. On this point Jesus spoke with the greatest plainness, as thus: "I have greater witness than that of John; for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me." Quite as clear and unmistakable is this: "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe

not me, believe the works; that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in Him." The authority to do good is inherent in the good life, and is proved by the "works" of such a life.

But keen and shrewd as the mind of Jesus was, it was never satisfied with intellectual victory, never stopped with that. The mind was the servant and proclaimer, not of petty doctrine, but of great and eternal truths, of principles which go to the very roots of life and character. To the young man who asked justice in the matter of an inheritance which had been withheld from him, as he thought unjustly, Jesus, after refusing to decide, said: "Beware of covetousness"—so it seems that a man may covet wrongfully even that which is rightfully his. The answer of Jesus in the case of the woman who had had seven husbands—"in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven?"—concludes thus: "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." We

can readily believe that "when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine."

There are many to-day who would be astonished at his answer in the case of the tribute money—"Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's"—if they could be made to understand that they are going against it every time they ask Cæsar, that is the state, to act in the sphere of religion.

That Jesus valued shrewdness is proved by the most difficult of all parables, the parable of the unjust steward. Of course he did not commend the dishonesty and trickiness, but he did commend the prudence and foresight, and he even went so far as to make the lord of the steward commend "the unjust steward because he had done wisely." Jesus himself drew the following moral: "The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light."

There is, then, a place, and a very important place, for a certain worldly wisdom in caring for and serving spiritual things and heavenly inter-

ests. I think it highly necessary that emphasis be put on this quality of the mind of Jesus, if for no other reason than to counteract the theory that he was a mere dreamer, helpless in the hands of his foes. So, then, we have a mind that was keen and shrewd, and also deep and broad, as deep as truth, as broad as the universe of Almighty God. It was a perfect machine, as perfect as the life and character that spoke through it, which is just what we should expect. It ought not to be difficult, studying this mind, to understand how mightily important is the part which intellect plays in religion.

The fact that man's mind can not comprehend everything has often been appealed to as a reason for insisting that it should not try to comprehend anything. This is to open the door wide to superstition and fanaticism, and to turn into darkness—as far as this is possible—"the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Men must, as their Master did, think about God, religion, life, truth, and even the Bible, and if they think, they must think, again as he did, bravely and conscientiously. Jesus

many times, as the prophets before him, and as St. Paul did later, appealed to the minds of his hearers. As well say that we should not love God because we can not love him as he deserves to be loved, as to say that we should not reason about him and his revelation because we can not reason adequately, as of course we can not. Men are related through their minds to the eternal intelligence as they are through their hearts to the eternal love.

It was the ever-living "Word," or intelligence, that "was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth." God is the great thinker, and he made man in his own image. The conclusive argument is that Jesus used his mind continually and fearlessly, and trusted largely to it. When he was but twelve years old we find "him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions."

It would not be necessary to argue this point were it not for the fact that many people seem to think—indeed actually hold—that ignorance

is a proof of piety, and unintelligence a synonym for faith. It is true that we are to receive the word as little children, and that it is not to "the wise and prudent," but to babes that certain things are revealed. But this means that men should be humble in their thinking, unsophisticated, and strangers to intellectual pride, as to all other pride. It is also true that they should pray for divine illumination, pray that God will "enlighten their minds more and more with the light of the everlasting gospel." But also they must be educated, or educate themselves in things of the mind as well as in those of the Spirit. St. Peter writes: "Add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge." Dullness of mind is neither a virtue nor a vice—it is a misfortune. As men strive to attain something of the moral and spiritual perfection of Jesus, so they should endeavor to win for themselves something of his intellectual power and perfection, and to enter into his mind and understand, as far as possible, its processes. The call is to right thinking as well as to right living—indeed the two go together, and are intimately related. If

Christians had more of his keenness of intellect there would be less turmoil, confusion and misunderstanding in the religious world.

## XVI

### DELICACY

In nothing is the beautiful delicacy of the mind of Jesus more strikingly shown than in his dignified reserve. Offering himself and his help in fullest measure to his fellowmen, his general attitude was much like that praised by Browning:

Shall I sonnet-sing you about myself?
Do I live in a house you would like to see?
Is it scant of gear, has it store of pelf?
"Unlock my heart with a sonnet-key?"

Invite the world, as my betters have done?
"Take notice: this building remains on view,
Its suites of reception every one,
Its private apartment and bedroom, too;

"For ticket, apply to the publisher."
No: thanking the public, I must decline.
A peep through my window, if folk prefer;
But, please you, no foot over threshold of mine!

Publicity seems to have been almost painful to Jesus, and yet he had to face and submit to it as a disagreeable necessity. Often he sought to avoid it, and sometimes was successful in doing so. Even amid the riot and tumult that so frequently swirled and roared around him, he many times, we must believe, found peace and seclusion by retirement and withdrawal into the depths of his being. "If thou do these things," his brethren once said to him, "shew thyself to the world." What an up-to-date sound the words have! Against them we may set the words of Jesus: "See thou tell no man," spoken after the performance of a notable miracle. When he healed the deaf man of Decapolis "he charged them that they should tell no man." It was so with many of the miracles.

Jesus seems almost to have regarded honorable fame, even though it might have brought with it a recognition of his claims, as vulgar notoriety. What we see is the shrinking of a delicate and sensitive nature from what would today be called advertising. Throughout his life he suffered from contact with sensation-mon-

gers, mere wonder-lovers, and seekers for "signs." There was nothing chilling or haughty in his reserve, but do we not find in it respect for his own personality, and the deepest reverence for the sacredness of his mission?

This reserve showed itself in other ways which were quite as remarkable, judged by present standards. Jesus never told all that was in his mind. Indeed he expressly refrained from doing so. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now," "hereafter I will not talk much with you"—yet how much he might have said! He knew what it would be good for men to hear, and more than that he withheld. His mind operated under a superb self-restraint. It must have impressed those who heard him, as it certainly has impressed men since his day, as being filled with wisdom, goodness and truth that were never drawn on anywhere near to the point of exhaustion. His was a strength "not half put forth." There was always something kept back, something that might have been drawn on were there need. So it is that we get the impression of great power.

Many are the men who write and talk out everything that is in their minds, and then are under the necessity of re-storing them, unless they are content, as some are, to write and talk mere vanities. This is perhaps true of the "orators" as a class. Those whose delight is in talking have no time to read, think, or meditate—and no disposition to—and as a result they sink into intellectual shallowness and mental anemia. This, it is to be feared, is not an age of reserve—it is an age of teachers or would-be teachers, and not of learners.

People would benefit greatly from a reverent study of the mind of Jesus from this point of view. No one, of course, can match it, but every one can employ his method, and by careful, and it may be painful cultivation, develop something of his fine scorn for publicity and advertising, something of his capacity for limiting speech to real necessities for its use. To have "many things to say" and not to say them—there is virtue in such restraint. To say nothing when one has nothing to say is the merest common sense.

This same delicacy was shown by Jesus in his

attitude toward the weak, the suffering and the erring. There was a certain chivalrousness in his bearing toward women, even sinful women, perhaps toward them most of all. "All bare him witness," we read in St. Luke's Gospel, "and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth." Immediately afterward, those who heard "the gracious words," so the record runs, "were filled with wrath, and rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong." Why? Because the gracious words were followed by words that were the reverse of gracious.

This suggests the mistake that so many make when they think of delicacy as weakness. That, it most decidedly need not be, and was not in this case. Jesus could be, and at times was, stern almost to the point of hardness, and was capable of anger almost flaming in its intensity. On one occasion, that of the cleansing of the temple, he resorted to physical violence. But even these acts and words were the reactions of a delicate and sensitive mind to wrong and outrage. The

word "delicacy" of course has many meanings, and weakness is one of them, according to the dictionary-makers. But it also means fineness of texture and perfection of adjustment, as in the case of machinery. The combination of enormous power and perfect precision—or delicacy—in a machine always stirs the wondering admiration of the observer. So it was with the mind of Jesus—it was strong and virile, and yet delicate in its texture and operation. There is a rebuke here for another class of people—those who identify power with roughness, rudeness, arrogance and disregard for the rights of others, and who recognize no power except that exercised by the conquerors. Arnold's verse is a needed corrective:

"We shall not then deny a course
To every thought the mass ignore;
We shall not then call hardness force,
Nor lightness wisdom any more."

Those who call "hardness force" will, of course, not see much force in the mind or character of Jesus. But they are mistaken—to their

own hurt and loss. In one sense, however, they are right, for of force, as the word is generally used and understood, there was none in this mind and character. But with power, intellectual, moral and spiritual power, both mind and character were marvelously endowed.

What is the greatest power in the life of the world and of men, if not love? That of itself tends to make a nature fine, regardful of the rights of others, intellectually gentle and tolerant—and strong, "strong in the strength which God supplies." If there were more fineness and delicacy in Christian lives, and more shown by Christians in their relation to Almighty God and their fellows, we should see a much closer approach to the ideal that Jesus set up for his religion. Vulgarity, buffoonery and ignorance would shrink into the background, and there would be an end to the business of prying and probing into the lives of others, and of the harsh judgments that are so often pronounced in the name of him who said: "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye

mete, it shall be measured to you again." Jesus always respected the sanctities of the human soul, and would, one may be sure, be shocked by the lightness—and often impertinence—with which many to-day talk of, and interfere with and order, the relations between a soul and its Maker, relations which were to him beautifully and divinely sacred. "A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory."

# XVII

## PURITY

It may seem strange—and perhaps presumptuous—to speak of purity in connection with Jesus, for that quality is denied to him by no one. It is taken for granted. Yet the word has a much broader and more positive meaning than that which, as a rule, is assigned to it. Of "clean hands and a pure heart" we read much in Scripture, but little is said of the pure mind, except by way of contrast with the "carnal" mind. The first two lines of the stanza from the Keble poem will serve as a text:

> "Thee, on the bosom laid
> Of a pure virgin mind."

By a "pure virgin mind" is meant, not merely a clean mind, but one that is untouched and untainted by evil, dedicated to all that is good and

true, one that is holy in the sense of sacred, healthful and sound. Writing to Titus, St. Paul says: "Unto the pure all things are pure; but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled." This, of course, does not mean that impure thoughts, objects and practises cease to be so when contemplated or followed by the pure, but rather that to impure minds even the things that are in essence pure may, as they frequently do, take on the quality of impurity. It also means that the truly pure mind does not pry after impurity, as when Habakkuk says of God: "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity." Purity is thus an inward condition, wrought into the very substance of personality. Jesus expressed the thought thus: "There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man. . . . That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covet-

ousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: All these evil things come from within, and defile the man."

The Episcopal Church puts on the lips of her children the following prayer: "Lord, we beseech Thee, grant thy people grace to withstand the temptations of the world, the flesh and the devil; and with pure hearts and minds to follow Thee, the only true God; through Jesus Christ our Lord." The prayer is for pure minds as well as pure hearts. Purity is a great deal more than absence of impurity—it is a state of mind that is alien to impurity. Such was the purity of the mind of Jesus. He discussed the problem, as was so often his custom, in a parable: "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none. Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man

is worse than the first." The house was clean—negatively pure—but it was empty, and fairly inviting invasion.

The pure mind, therefore, is the full mind, the mind crowded with high and noble thoughts, holy desires, exalted ideals, generous feelings and a passion for service. In short it must be tenanted by God. Such was the mind of Jesus—it was pure in this absolute sense. We think of impurity—and this is especially true of men of our race—as connoting one sin. But therein we make a great mistake. No mind can be pure that is selfish, worldly, dishonest, self-deceiving, or false in any way. Even "foolishness" is a sin, for it tops the list of sins catalogued by Jesus as coming from within the man, and defiling him. Foolishness is ranked with "evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts," and the rest. So purity seems to have its intellectual side, and to include wisdom. Surely the pure mind must be the home of pure thoughts, and thoughts are the result of an intellectual process. The mind of Jesus was of one texture throughout, armed at all points against evil, armed by

being filled with all that was pure, true, honest and good, and warmed by love.

In our hymns we sing of God's "awful purity," and we do well, if we think of "awful" as meaning awe-inspiring, as absolute perfection always must be. In that way one may speak of the "awful purity" of Jesus, for it did inspire awe, and elicit the worship and homage of men and women. But it was very different from the idea of purity held by many people who think of it as lonely, remote, self-centered, unsympathetic, cold, and even as a little hard and repellent. There is in it the element of fear—fear of contamination. Such purity—and let it at once be said that it is better than none at all—is always consciously on its guard. The man possessing it is disposed to be narrow and intolerant in his judgment of others, and as a rule it is necessary to class him with those to whom nothing is pure. He is easily offended and shocked, and is likely to be a strong and firm believer in the principle of censorship.

The purity of Jesus, on the contrary, was winning. No sinner, who knew himself to be a sin-

ner, ever came into contact with that purity without desiring it for himself. It was not repellent, but attractive; not remote and lonely, but near at hand and social. There was in it no fear of contamination, or of being shocked, as Simon was shocked by the presence of the sinful woman. In it was nothing of self but everything of God. Kindness, gentleness, tenderness, tolerance and sympathy were perhaps the dominating traits of the mind and soul that were thus pure. In a sense it may be said that Jesus was no more conscious of possessing this purity than he was conscious of breathing. It was native to him, graven deep in his personality. Never paraded, it seemed to emanate from him, as virtue went out from him when the poor woman touched the hem of his garment and was made whole.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews writes: "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high

priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." The same writer says that he "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." For that reason the writer of the epistle would have us "come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Often it seems as though little mercy were to be expected from earthly purity. But infinite purity is the very fountain and source of mercy. We pray that "we may purify ourselves, even as he is pure," and it is a great and searching prayer. But it is also one that can never be answered without the co-operation of those who use it.

The mind of Jesus can not, any more than can the mind of any one else, be isolated from the other parts of his nature,—soul, spirit and conscience. All these influenced and colored it. His mind was pure because his heart and soul were pure, and contrariwise. He served God, as he bade his followers do, with all his heart,

with all his soul, with all his mind. The three were bound together in a perfect harmony and unity, and were "the pliant instruments of the infinite will." "The high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity" dwelt in him, as that "high and lofty One" is "with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite one." His was "life in God and union there"—and "the rest follows."

I can think of no task more worthy the efforts of good men and women, who really desire to help their fellows and themselves—as there is none more difficult—than that of trying to make purity, especially purity of mind, lovely and winning. One can almost hear some victim of the superstition of government say "there ought to be a law." There was plenty of law in Israel when Jesus was on earth, almost as much as there is now. There is only one way to succeed in the task of making purity lovely and winning, and that is through individual cultivation of that purity which we worship in Jesus, and by following his example. It is a question of loyalty to

him, and so men have prayed for grace "to follow the blessed steps of his most holy life."

"Sir, we would see Jesus," so said "certain Greeks" to Philip amid the tumult of Palm Sunday. What was their motive? What were they looking for? Such questions at once spring to the lips, but they can not be answered. The men may have been moved by mere curiosity, and may have been looking for an earthly king, a mere wonder-worker. Who can "see Jesus" as he was, and is, the infinitely pure, except in as far as he is like him, or desires to become like him? Zaccheus saw him, as did the sinful woman, and the woman taken in adultery, but the eyes of the officially and professedly pure were holden so that they could not, and never did, see him. Vision of the eternal is possible only to those who have striven to attune their souls to its harmonies. In that Old Testament which poor misguided men are trying to degrade into a textbook of science, we read: "When the servant of the man of God was risen early and gone forth, behold, an host encompassed the city both with horses and chariots. And his servant said unto him,

Alas, my master! how shall we do? And he answered, Fear not; for they that be with us are more than they that be with them. And Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man; and he saw: and, behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha." Jesus is the greater Elisha, through whom weak despairing and terrified men may get a vision of heavenly reinforcement in their battle for that purity which is "from above."

# XVIII

## POISE

THROUGHOUT his whole public career Jesus lived among enemies and was daily confronted by the most serious problems and dangers. Issues of the gravest sort, and controversies often of exceeding bitterness, thronged his pathway. His ministry began with a terrible struggle with the Tempter, and it ended amid treason and betrayal at the hands of two of his disciples and friends, with the agony of Gethsemane, scourgings and insults, a mock trial—and the Cross. He was weary and often lonely—always lonely in the sense that spiritual eminence ever is—misunderstood by the people whom he had disappointed, who hailed him as king on Palm Sunday, and on Good Friday yelled "Crucify him!" Saddest of all, it is written that "neither did his brethren believe in him." Duties

pressed on him from every side. "My father worketh hitherto, and I work," he said. And that work was carried steadily forward in spite of multifarious distractions. There is many a worker who resents the slightest disturbance, who gets out of his stride the moment his routine is interfered with, and who must—or feels that he must—be guarded against all intrusion. But the greatest and hardest work ever done in this world was done under conditions so confusing, distracting and distressing as almost to have justified abandonment of the task.

Never was there greater need for mental poise, and never was mental poise more splendidly exhibited. It is one of the greatest marvels of this marvelous life. Of course I know that there is a theory that Jesus was for a time mentally unbalanced, a theory which seems to have been accepted by Mr. George Moore, and expounded by him in his story, "The Brook Kerith." Mr. Moore assumes that when the mother and brethren of Jesus sought in vain to approach and speak with him when he was instructing the people, they believed him to be beside himself.

But this very incident proves exactly the contrary, for it ends with an exhortation which is altogether in the vein of the whole teaching of Jesus: "Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Here is the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—here the exemplification of the teaching of the duty of forsaking, if need be, earthly relatives for the gospel's sake. In this instance the mind of Jesus worked straight along the line which he had originally marked out for himself and which he followed to the end. What his relatives may have thought we do not know, nor does Mr. Moore. But we do know that if they thought what Mr. Moore believes they thought, they were mistaken.

One can not read the gospels with any care without getting the impression that Jesus was at all times master of himself. It is impossible to think of his mind as having been at any time

perturbed or clouded or panic-stricken. In many crises he reasoned himself into the right course. He had a reason for refusing to pray to his Father for "twelve legions of angels" to protect him—"how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" Such was his answer, and it was, from his point of view, conclusive.

If ever there was a case of *mens æqua in arduis,* it is this one. We have all the strength and heroism of the Stoic without his hardness, and without the pretense that sometimes marked the practice of certain of the Stoic philosophers. Jesus was not ashamed to shrink from suffering, though never afraid to meet it, and never was his mind put to confusion. "Neither be ye," Jesus said to his disciples, "of doubtful mind"—he certainly was not. St. James writes thus: "He that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord. A double minded man is unstable in all his ways." Again he writes: "Purify your hearts, ye double minded." Many of the weak-

nesses of Christian lives may be traced directly to this double mindedness or lack of poise. Men are affected as they ought not to be, by things external to themselves, are hopelessly plunged in grief, or wildly and foolishly elated by joy, and are irritated, vexed and sore when things do not, as they say, go their way. So they are not master of themselves, and never have a clear vision of life and its duties. Their trouble is a lack of poise, that poise which is hardly more than another name for strength, courage, calmness and serenity which, in the life of Jesus, to a very great extent were the fruit of poise. He knew that he was in the world to do the will of a God "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

The mission of Jesus, to do the will of the Father and to show him to the world, is the mission of every man, to be performed to the very best of his ability. So, men need to look to their minds as well as their souls, and to study—and pattern themselves after—the serene and steadfast mind of Jesus, which should be their ideal and model. He did his work, unswayed by false

ambition, untempted by base lures, unconfused by distractions, and unterrified by danger, or the threat of it. Steadfastly he held to his course, though it led to the Cross. There seems to have been a momentary breakdown on the Cross, when he cried out: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" But even in that supreme hour he prayed for his murderers, forgave the penitent thief, commended his mother to the care of St. John, and closed his earthly life with the words: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

Tracing the career back from the cross to the wilderness temptation we find an absolute consistency, with not even the shadow of a departure from the principles and truth lived by Jesus of Nazareth. One not prejudiced in his favor has said that he "died like a god." Surely we may also say that he lived like a god, and that he was

"Strong son of God, immortal love."

# XIX

## PROPHETIC

It is to me more impressive to believe that Jesus saw the future simply as the working out of the present, rather than through the use of supernatural power. Whatever else he was, he was a great statesman to whom "the signs of the times" were an open book, and to whose mind the effects of causes plainly at work presented themselves as unescapable. Prophecy, as far as it is concerned with prediction, is for the most part based on a study of contemporaneous events, and is an inference from them. Forces operating at a given time must issue in certain results in the perhaps distant future.

Writing in 1903, eleven years before the outbreak of the Great War, the late Professor Sumner said: "Never, from the day of barbarism

down to our own time, has every man in a society been a soldier until now; and the armaments of to-day are immensely more costly than ever before. There is only one limit possible to the war preparations of a modern European state; that is, the last man and the last dollar it can control. What will come of the mixture of sentimental social philosophy and warlike policy? There is only one thing to be rationally expected, and that is a frightful effusion of blood in revolution and war during the century now opening." Again, far back in the 'seventies, studying existing religious conditions, he foretold the religious situation much as it exists to-day

Turning to the New Testament, we read: "The Pharisees also with the Sadducees came, and tempting desired him that he would shew them a sign from heaven. He answered and said unto them, When it is evening, ye say, It will be fair weather: for the sky is red. And in the morning, It will be foul weather to-day: for the sky is red and lowring. O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?" It must be inferred from this that Jesus was a student of "the

signs of the times." As he saw them, they pointed directly to a catastrophe. I do not, as I have said, think he had any social program except that involved in his idea of the kingdom of God, in which love, faith, peace, purity and justice should reign. His object was the spiritualization of society, and of man as a social being. But did he not have a program that bore directly on political conditions and grew out of them?

Into the question of Messiahship I have neither intention nor desire to go. But Jesus may well have sought to save his people from the frightful consequences of armed resistance to the might of Rome, and to do it through a transformation of Israel into a spiritual kingdom, and by directing the ambitions of his countrymen away from armed struggle, which could end only in defeat and ruin, to self-conquest. Such a vision as this would have been wholly in accord with his teaching. His thought must have been that the only conquest of the world that should be thought of or desired was through that self-conquest, which was almost the burden of his message.

The Messiahship of Jesus could not have been

more clearly shown than in his effort to save his people from the doom which he foresaw. So his political program, if it may be called that, involved the utter abandonment of political methods and an entire reliance on spiritual influences and powers.

The kingdom of God, as he conceived it, was leaven, and that is what he would have had Israel become—a renewing force, a vivifying influence, a life principle. Perhaps he had in mind the words of Zachariah : "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts; It shall yet come to pass, that there shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities; and the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to pray before the Lord, and to seek the Lord of Hosts: I will go also. Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts: In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with

you." Such the prophet believed, and such Jesus believed was the divinely appointed destiny of Israel. But Jesus saw to his sorrow that it was not to be. "The signs of the times" pointed to ruin through faithlessness to mission. As the fair day was inferred from the red sunset, so the doom was inferred from "the signs of the times." Whether the accounts of the predictions, or some of them, were written after their fulfillment or not, does not much matter, for there is no reason to doubt that the words of Jesus are accurately reported.

We read in St. Luke's gospel: "When he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knowest not the time of thy visitation."

In the gospel of St. Mark, the earliest of the gospels, it is written: "And as he went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here! And Jesus answering said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." St. Matthew reports the words of Jesus as follows: "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand): Then let them which be in Judæa flee into the mountains: Let him which is on the housetop not come down to take any thing out of his house: Neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day: for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no

flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." There are few horrors in history greater than the siege, storming and destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans within forty years after the crucifixion, to which the prophecies of Jesus plainly point. In other words the political policy which he sought to change brought precisely the catastrophe that he said it would bring—he was able to "discern the signs of the times."

Such is the truly prophetic mind, such was the mind of Jesus. Why is it that, as he said, nations disregard and kill their prophets if not for the reason that they warn of the terrible consequences of the sins and follies of a people who never like to have their sins and follies pointed out? It has been so century after century, is so to-day, though there are few prophets, and so most of our statesmen are safe.

But it was not so in the days of Zachariah or in those of Jesus. The old prophet wrote: "It shall come to pass, that when any shall yet prophesy, then his father and his mother that begat him shall say unto him, Thou shalt not live;

for thou speakest lies in the name of the Lord: and his father and his mother that begat him shall thrust him through when he prophesieth. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the prophets shall be ashamed every one of his vision, when he hath prophesied; neither shall they wear a rough garment to deceive: But he shall say, I am no prophet, I am an husbandman; for man taught me to keep cattle from my youth. And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends."

But though prophets suffer with—and sometimes at the hands of—the people whom they would help and save, they can not be defeated. The penalty invariably follows a refusal or failure to heed "the signs of the times." A man wise enough to read them truly and a people sensible—and humble—enough to follow his leadership must co-exist and co-labor if the doom is to be averted. So, in Jesus we see the prophetic mind in its perfection—it was prophetic because it was great, wise and clear-visioned. His

prophecies were not merely local—they were universal, and ever timely. To those who thought that special guilt attached to the few people on whom a certain tower fell, Jesus said: "I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Like causes still produce like effects, and "the signs of the times" still warn.

# XX

## THE INTELLECTUALS

It is not surprising that the more the so-called "intellectuals" study the mind and character of Jesus the more they admire him. Indeed, it would almost seem as though the greatest interest in him at this time was found in men and women of this class. Writing in *Foundations,* a most excellent book, the Reverend Neville S. Talbot, at the time fellow, tutor and chaplain of Balliol College, Oxford, now Bishop of Pretoria, said: "He came to seek and save those who knew themselves to be lost. He has been impotent for centuries owing to the spiritual complacency of men. He has suffered every degree of patronage by intellectuals who have been interested in him but have had no need of him. . . . The times of the impotence of Jesus

Christ are passing. He was ever powerless with those who did not need him."

Something must be said of this attitude, and this seems as good a place as any to say it. Who is there, outside the moron class, who is not, or would not be, if he read the Gospels, "interested" in Jesus? I spoke early in this discussion of the patronage of eulogy, such as is shown by those who profess to "admire" Jesus. One might as well "admire" God, or the force of gravitation. Of these merely interested and admiring folk it must be said that they do not know what the mind of Jesus is, and never will know as long as they maintain their present attitude. That mind was a part—and a most important part—of a divine and perfect nature, influencing that nature and being influenced by it. It was lit by the divine truth, guided by the divine spirit, and warmed by the divine love. There is in the universe of God no such thing as pure mind, and there was nothing of this in Jesus.

It was necessary to limit this discussion, as far as possible, to its subject, which is the mind of Jesus, and so other elements and factors have

been excluded, not because they are unimportant, but because they have no proper place here. I would not, however, have it thought that I see in Jesus only mind, or believe that in all cases the mind was the determining cause of his action. If men see fit to "admire" it, that is, I suppose, their right.

But they ought to admire it sufficiently to accept its leadership, be guided by its counsels, and rely wholly on its conclusions. It is not enough to stand on the sidelines and applaud and cheer—which is what "patronage by intellectuals" amounts to. It is an insult to the mind which these people profess to admire, a mind engaged in the fiercest struggle with the forces of evil, a struggle in which every man is pledged by his very manhood to participate. Better deny Jesus than merely "admire" him. Those who are "interested in him but have no need of him" should reflect that Jesus "was ever powerless with those who did not need him," and that "he has been impotent for centuries owing to the spiritual complacency of men."

Returning then to the mind of Jesus, it was

no mere thinking machine. It thought, as I have tried to show, along certain clearly defined lines, and to a definite end. Every thought of that mind was dictated by love for man, and the desire to save him from sin, and from himself. Here was the material with and on which the intellectual powers of Jesus worked. His purpose was, not to create a philosophy, much less to win the "admiration" of men, but to re-create the human race, and give it a fresh start. No thought that is not dominated by morality, or that is not directed toward a moral and spiritual end, is of the least value—indeed it may be positively harmful. It is from this point of view, and with this pre-conception, that the mind of Jesus should be studied.

Nowhere can it be more easily and profitably studied than in the parables, which throw a wonderful light, not only on the path that men must tread, but on the mind from which the parables proceeded. In them will be found the most astonishing combination of the obvious and the profound. By merely telling a story, and in the simplest way, Jesus was able to flash the deepest

truths on the most benighted soul, to bring the sublimest truths down to the comprehension of the humblest understanding, even to the understanding of some who did not wish to understand.

Such was the method of the operation of the mind of Jesus which always worked for results and never for the mere joy of the working. He was the good shepherd, sinful men were his flock, and his kingdom was the fold. That kingdom was a grain of mustard seed, leaven, a net cast into the sea, a field in which grew both wheat and tares. Man was the lost coin, the lost sheep or the prodigal son. The loving Father was represented by the woman who searched and found the coin, the shepherd who sought and found the sheep, and the affectionate father who tenderly welcomed the erring boy back home. The elder brother in the last parable, and the Pharisee in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, stand for the self-righteous. The necessity for importunity in prayer, the danger of delay in making decisions in the spiritual life—"the door was shut"—and the fatal consequences of a lack of vigilance, all are set forth in parables in which

we have a graphic picture, not only of the mind of Jesus, but of the mind of Jesus at work. A more interesting study—or one more vital—there could hardly be. Again we see that mind's flexibility, shrewdness, comprehensiveness and profundity. All the great problems of life are handled with an amazing lightness of touch, and yet with a depth of thought and feeling that fills one, not with admiration, but with awe and reverence.

The moral for our "intellectuals" is that the mind does not exist in and for itself. It should be subservient to spirit and conscience. It was so with the mind of Jesus. What he thought is more important than how he thought. There have been minds that were great—as minds—and yet wholly dominated by selfishness, and devoted to the accomplishment of unworthy purposes. Of their powers of thought and concentration there can be no question, and considered merely as machines they have challenged and merited the admiration of the world. But they were incomplete because there was in them no moral or spiritual element.

It seems, therefore, that a mind to be complete must be something more than what is generally understood by the word. It should be the expression of personality, and the whole personality. In the case of Jesus it was the expression of infinite love, of which he was the incarnation. When such a mind speaks, it would seem that it ought to be obeyed rather than "admired." We can trust its conclusions because it is supreme as mind; we can follow its commands because they are dictated by wisdom and love. The question for those who are at present content with admiring is whether they will co-operate with him whom they admire in the great work which he came to earth to do—and is still doing. His mind never expressed itself more clearly than in the words: "Follow me"—the call is to action, to an active alliance with him. He never sought "admiration," does not seek it now. What he sought and yearned for was love, and the loyalty flowing therefrom.

In his *Table Talk,* Coleridge says: "The best way to bring a clever young man, who has become skeptical and unsettled, to reason, is to

make him *feel* something in any way. Love, if sincere and unworldly, will, in nine instances out of ten, bring him to a sense and assurance of something real and actual; and that sense alone will make him *think* to a sound purpose, instead of dreaming that he is thinking." After his resurrection Jesus three times asked St. Peter: "Lovest thou me?" So the mind of Jesus was a loving mind, and it was this mind that said: "Whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, can not be my disciple." For there can be no love apart from sacrifice, since sacrifice in behalf of the loved object is the proof—and there can be none other—of love. It is almost blasphemous to talk of being "interested" in this great leader and spiritual genius. Nicodemus admired him, but his open disciples died for him. It is time to have done with "patronage by intellectuals" and the patronage of eulogy.

## XXI

### EVANGELICALS

Opposed to the class just considered is that other class made up of people who accept the conventional doctrines without thinking about them, accept them conventionally, rest in phrases and catchwords, people who are, according to their light, followers of Jesus, and who worship rather than admire him. As far as they are sincere—and most of them are—they are much nearer the kingdom than are the "intellectuals." If it were not for the work done and the sacrifices made by members of this class the world would be much less fit for human habitation than it is. In this group there are, unhappily, many people who merely play at religion. It was to such that Jesus spoke when he said: "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which

I say?" There is of course no loyalty in such men, no more than there is among those who pride themselves—often with little reason—on their intellect.

To seek to understand Jesus without following him is not much worse than to try to follow him without endeavoring to understand him. As the one class needs to learn that there can be no complete mind in which there is no love, so the other needs to learn that there can be no love apart from mind. It seems to follow that there is great need in both classes for a serious consideration of the function of intellect in religion, and of the relation between the two. Long ago it was said that the man who knows only his Bible can not be said to know even that. It is quite as true that the man who knows Jesus only in terms of the popular theology can not be said really to know him at all. It is the case of these latter with which it is now proposed to deal.

The mind of Jesus, then, was not emotional, though all the great emotions, such as love, mercy, tenderness and pity dwelt in it, or greatly influenced it, if we chose to make those emotions

resident elsewhere. It was not a mind that rested in formulas and phrases, or that was much concerned with machinery.

The religious jargon which is to-day so popular in certain circles would hardly have been understood by Jesus. In the New Testament we have the record of a great and fine intellect handling the profoundest problems that can engage the mind and heart. That Jesus thought deeply about them, and about the decisions that he found it necessary to make, we must, as has already been suggested, believe. What he thought, and how he thought, we must know, as far as we can, if we are to be intelligent Christians, inspired by an intelligent loyalty. Many of our religious dogmas and systems have a wholly non-intellectual root, which can only mean that they are not centered in Jesus, who was intellect, as well as heart and soul. Men must think with him as well as "suffer with him"—perhaps the two processes are closely allied.

Christianity, as developed by St. Paul, is by no means a simple and easily understood reli-

gion. Those who think it is can never have carefully read St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, of which Coleridge said: "I think St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans the most profound work in existence; and I hardly believe that the writings of the old Stoics, now lost, could have gone deeper." Even St. Peter was puzzled by the Pauline writings, for he says that in them "are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." Religion severed from knowledge and intellect is either superstition or fanaticism, or both. There is little danger that too much intellect will find its way into popular religion—too much intellect or knowledge.

The mind that it is most necessary to study is that of Jesus. It was, as has been said, not emotional, or wrapped up in phrases or formulas, nor was it conventional or static, or in any way fettered. Christians ought to think of Jesus somewhat as mind, as knowledge, as the eternal Word, the divine wisdom. The religion of Jesus

is an intellectual as well as a moral and spiritual triumph. Unless the mind is converted there is no conversion. Repentance is an act of the mind. It is because Jesus is the thinker that he is the Saviour. This mind was an ever-learning mind, always open to the truth. It is said that "yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered." To his mind faith was not a "deposit" to be guarded and defended as such, but a living, expanding and vitalizing principle. Here then we see a free mind dealing freely and courageously with life in all its phases—this present life and life to come.

There is such a thing as loyalty to the mind of Jesus, and it should be cultivated by those who call themselves by his name, and profess loyalty to him—which is, it must be sadly confessed, often only loyalty to certain things that men have said about Jesus. As we open our spirits and hearts to his heart and spirit, we ought also to open our minds to his mind, which is a reservoir of power.

There were certain men in the early days of Christianity known as Gnostics, who made much

of what they supposed to be knowledge, but which was, as Coleridge says, only "knowingness,"—a very different thing. "It is this gnosis," Coleridge continues, "or knowingness, which, the apostle says 'puffeth up'—not knowledge, as we translate it." What is so greatly needed by devout Christians is a knowledge, not only of what Jesus taught and did, but of his mind, its general attitude, its way of working. This, it seems to me, is indispensable to even the beginning of an understanding of him, his teaching, his life and mission. Men are saved quite as much by the truth which he preached and lived, and the light that he was, as by the blood which he shed. What we have to do with is not a mere past transaction, even as august a one as that of Calvary, but a living force set in motion by his life and mind. "We have the mind of Christ," writes St. Paul. All should have it, as far as it is possible to appropriate and absorb it into their consciousness.

# XXII

## INSTITUTIONAL

As THE mind of Jesus was scientific—at least that is my own belief—it must have valued institutions as the safe-guarders of truth and its embodiment. He preached the gospel of a kingdom, both spiritual and material; he left behind him an organization of thoroughly trained men commissioned to continue his work. He adopted baptism as a part of the new organization, and insisted on its importance; he instituted the Lord's Supper. The details are unimportant—unimportant certainly in comparison with the fact that Jesus did not leave his teaching to make its way in the world of itself. There was a concreteness in his conception of the spiritual far removed from the idea of those who think of it as a mere "aura" or ghostly emanation. The

spiritual life was to him a life that could be imparted, and that was to be nourished, trained and lived. He sought to spiritualize the material, and he used the material as the vehicle for the spirit. His attitude toward institutions was precisely the same as his attitude toward traditions. Both to him were valuable—indispensable indeed—but both might outlive their usefulness and become positive hindrances to the development of the spirit of man—as the Christian church of our own day, under foolish and narrow leadership, may quite conceivably become.

There are some who seem to think of the truth of Jesus as a formless thing, almost gaseous in its nature. But in the thought of Jesus it had a positiveness, definiteness and concreteness that are unmistakable. But for the institutions which he created, it would have evaporated into something very like what the extreme Transcendentalists believe it to be, and then into nothingness. It took shape in his own personality, and then in his institutions.

In a certain sense the mind of Jesus was even theological, but his theology, such as it was, was

a skeleton, and as such was not to be worn on the outside. It was not the life of the structure, but its support, where support was needed. Jesus, as has been pointed out, wrote not a line, nor is there any evidence that he instructed his disciples to make record of his deeds and words. That he was anxious that his truth and influence should be perpetuated is clear enough, and that he expected it to be is equally clear. "Wheresoever," he said, "this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, he told for a memorial of her." It has been so. Jesus prayed for his followers to the end of time—"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe in me through their word." And he promised to be with his church "to the end of the world."

Organized Christianity has, it seems to me, made many mistakes, been guilty of many crimes, and often presented Jesus and his religion in exceedingly defective ways, as it is doing to-day. All this I have tried to show, with, I hope, some slight degree of success. But this must be said, that if there had been no organized Christianity

during the last two thousand years there would to-day be no Christianity of any sort, organized or unorganized. Jesus trusted to a living organization of God-possessed men to keep his religion alive and spread it to the ends of the earth, and this organization was of his own appointment, an institution of his own creation. The St. John of Browning speaks thus:

"If I live yet, it is for good, more love
Through me to men; be naught but ashes here
That keep awhile my semblance, who was John,—
Still, when they scatter, there is left on earth
No one alive who knew (consider this!)
—Saw with his eyes and handled with his hands
That which was from the first the Word of Life.
How will it be when none more saith 'I saw?' "

That was the problem and with it the mind of Jesus must have been very deeply engaged. The church, the sacraments and preaching are his answer and solution. However, his trust in these was not trust in mere machinery, but in the Spirit of God as their life and soul. These are among the material things which he would spiritualize. It is the same with them as with political

institutions which may survive in form—as they threaten to do in this country—long after all life has gone out of them, and which may be nullified, and in effect destroyed by a lack of loyalty to them and their spirit on the part of the people.

Preaching is also an institution, but one by which many people set little store. Yet the command of Jesus was to "preach the gospel to every creature." St. Paul in his letter to the Romans says: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" "Woe is unto me," he again says, "if I preach not the gospel!" And again: "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." In the books of the Acts of the Apostles it is written that while St. Paul was in Rome, he lived for two years "in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ." St. Mark records that "they went forth, and preached every

where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." These first preachers and chroniclers knew the mind of Jesus, and they clearly believed that the church was meant by him to be first of all a preaching church, and that the command "preach the gospel" was of at least equal dignity with the command "do this in remembrance of me."

Just as far as the church has ceased to be a preaching church, just as far as it has exalted even the sacraments above preaching, it has, in my opinion departed from the ideal of Jesus. Jesus himself preached incessantly for the adequate and very simple reason that he wished men to know his purpose for the world. The same need exists in our time, though perhaps, due to changed conditions, in somewhat different form. The responsibility of the preacher is great—almost overwhelming. We must recognize the difference between "the foolishness of preaching," by which, as St. Paul says, "it pleased God to save them that believe," and foolish preaching. Of the latter we have far too much. There is great need for a revival of the prophetic office.

To those who under-value what they call "mere words" is commended this saying of Jesus: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." That is true of all words humbly and bravely spoken of in the name of Jesus by consecrated men.

The church that is not a teaching and preaching church is not, no matter how perfect its organization or undisputed its orders, a living church. The late Professor Sumner, when rector of the Church of the Redeemer, at Morristown, New Jersey, said in a sermon: "I will not disparage any other form of labor in the Christian ministry, but I insist upon this, that the duty of preaching, that is, of persuading men's minds and informing their consciences by acute thought and living speech, is second to no duty of the Christian minister. A church may have long rolls of communicants, numerous and splendid edifices, proud traditions and a glorious history, but so soon as it ceases to teach and preach, to lead the thoughts of men and influence their judgment on living issues, it begins to die and nothing can save it."

Free, flexible, undogmatic as the mind of Jesus was, and slight as was its dependence on mere machinery as such, Jesus did see that Christian institutions were necessary if his message was to be carried to all men, if his religion was to survive. While truth can hardly be organized, men must organize about it, not so much to defend it as for the purpose of spreading it throughout the world. Thus we have the kingdom, the sacraments and preaching—which itself is a sort of sacrament—all of which proceeded directly from the divine mind of Jesus. To this extent it is very practically institutional. It was none the less spiritual, but rather more so since it sanctified the material, and used it to nourish and sustain the spiritual life of man. What was important was that the men of his day, and men to the remotest generations should know of him and his teaching, and be brought into direct and living contact with both. To that end the church, with all its defects, has labored, and in his name devoted men and women, representatives of the church, have gone to their deaths as to a feast—and it was all in accord with the mind of Jesus.

# XXIII

## LIGHT

I CAN think of no more radiantly beautiful passage of Scripture than this from the prophet Isaiah: "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people: but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." Take this in connection with the song of Simeon in honor of the infant Saviour: "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: For mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel."

It is impossible to think of the mind of Jesus except in connection with light, for it was and is light. Surely it may be said of him that the Gentiles did "come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." We are thinking of an unclouded, undimmed mind, in which there "is no darkness at all." It was the perfect reflection of the eternal light, the rays of which passed through it without the least refraction. Only those in whom there is something of light can be drawn to that mind, and of those it is true that "light seeking light doth light of light beguile." On the other hand, it is true that "the light shineth in darkness," because it shineth everywhere, and that "the darkness comprehended it not." God has ever revealed himself in the form of light, from the "burning bush" to the coming into human life of the true light which "lighteth every man that cometh into the world." And that is the Christian revelation, on its intellectual as well as its moral and spiritual side. It is of course the light of truth—"the utter truth the careless angels know." It seems as though no one would dare to undervalue it, or

turn from it. Men pray that God will "enlighten their minds more and more with the light of the everlasting gospel," and it is a great prayer.

The light was the light of truth—of a truth for which there was no conscious striving, for it was native to the soul of Jesus and in secure possession of it. A shrinking there sometimes was from the consequences of the truth, from the issues of an action dictated by it. But never was there any temptation to prefer falsehood to truth, or any doubt as to what the truth was. Jesus said of John the Baptist: "He was a burning and a shining light." He was also an uncompromising truth-lover and truth-teller. Of him Jesus also said: "He bare witness unto the truth." That is precisely what Jesus said of himself in answer to a question of Pilate: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."

With Pilate's question—"What is truth?"—this inquiry has nothing to do, nor is it concerned with the very obvious need of our groping race

for light, or with the effect of light and truth on human affairs. All these are themes for the preacher and lie beyond the scope of this discussion.

It is with the mind of Jesus as a light-bringer and truth-imparter that we now have to do. Whether light and truth molded and formed this mind, or whether they visited and possessed it because of what it was, is a question about which there might be almost endless speculation, but it would be, as most speculation is, futile. It is enough to know that there was an absolute intellectual loyalty to the truth, together with an undeviating walking in the light. The mind that was thus indwelt by light and truth must, because of that fact, have had certain qualities which have not thus far been directly mentioned. I am not thinking of moral qualities as such, for these are assumed in their highest possible development, but of those that are more strictly related to the mind. Of course it is impossible, even in thought, wholly to separate the mind from the moral sense, for each is dependent on the other, and each shares in the operations of

the other. But certain qualities are predominately intellectual, and it is these that I have in mind.

This illumined and luminous mind of Jesus, dominated wholly and solely by the truth, was of necessity the straight mind, direct in its working, and sure in reaching results. It is impossible to read the Gospels without being impressed by the intellectual straightness of their central figure. His mind never stumbled, never strayed to one side or the other of the line of truth. We note no efforts to reconcile contradictions, no attempts to believe contradictions, no yielding to the spirit that seeks a compromise between things that can not be compromised, and never any surrender to self-interest. These influences and temptations, above which the mind of Jesus easily soared, are largely responsible for the crooked thinking and crooked minds of men. Walking, if not in darkness, at least in dubious twilight, everything seems to them more or less uncertain, and seeing, as they think, so many "kinds of truth," they frequently make the wrong choice, or refuse to choose at all, or choose

both alternatives. Isaiah described a very large, and not a diminishing class of people when he said: "We wait for light, but behold obscurity; for brightness, but we walk in darkness. We grope for the wall like the blind, and we grope as if we had no eyes; we stumble at noon day as in the night." Where there is intellectual straightness there can be no confused thinking, no dimness of vision, and no blurring of vital distinctions.

There was a perfect alignment between the mind of Jesus and the truth—which he was—and a complete correspondence between that mind and the light that flooded his soul, and emanated from it. The result was an entire unity in the nature of Jesus, between his mind and spirit, between him and God. His whole personality went into action on the side of light and truth, each part reinforcing all the others, and being reinforced by them. Jesus revealed himself to the world as love, but hardly less important is his revelation of himself as light—"I am the light of the world." We do not think of Jesus sufficiently as one who thought out his

great principles, thought them out with an enlightened mind that was utterly loyal to the absolute truth.

It may be said of him that his whole "body thought," so complete in his case was the triumph of spirit over matter. He was proclaimed as the Word and mind of the universe through whom the great command "let there be light" was spoken. As the light dawned on the gray and lonely seas in the beginning, so with the advent in the flesh of that same Word, light dawned in human hearts, and has been making its way ever since. "If," said Jesus, "the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" I heard not long ago of one who was "bored" by reading of Jesus. One does not like to think of the abysmal darkness in which that soul is shrouded, and can only hope that it will not prove to be impenetrable. Perhaps it was a mere pose. Let us hope so. If light is to be desired, and if truth is lovely, then Jesus—who was and is both—is the most thrillingly interesting being of whom we have any record, interesting as an intellectual as well as a spiritual force.

As great a mind as that of Napoleon found him so, marveling at the loyalty he was able to command eighteen centuries after his death.

The mind of Jesus is the only utterly straight, uncompromised, uncompromising, unclouded, undimmed mind in history, the only mind in which there was perfect unity in itself, and unity with the mind of Almighty God. We need today, more than anything else, unity between the mind of Jesus and the mind of man, the merging of the world's thought in his thought. Only so can there be peace, order, clear and lofty thinking, and wise action. "Be not conformed to this world:" writes St. Paul, "but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God." Again he writes: "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind." "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace," the word is Isaiah's, "whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee." Intellectual contact and communion with such a mind as that of Jesus ought to be sought and prized as the greatest experience that a man can have, the greatest blessing that can come to him.

## XXIV

### KNOWLEDGE AND LOVE

WHENEVER we go to church, the minister, at the close of the service, dismisses us with this blessing: "The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, and the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you, and remain with you always." The words, which for the most part we hear so idly, are full of the deepest meaning, a meaning which bears directly on the present discussion. Peace is the divine preserver, and the prayer is that it may keep both heart and mind in both the knowledge and love of God, in order that the heart may know as well as love, and the

mind love as well as know. Peace, knowledge and love are, therefore, a great trinity, and it is thus that Jesus reveals himself, and through himself reveals God.

It is a strange thing that a religion into which so much mind and knowledge went should be thought of by those who profess it as in danger at the hands of knowledge, and as something with which the mind has very little to do. If it be said that the knowledge referred to in the benediction is knowledge of God, the answer is that all knowledge, if it be truly such, is knowledge of God—and from God.

Long ago the connection between divine revelation and human wisdom was pointed out by the prophet Daniel, who reported one of his visions thus: "None of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand." One might have thought that the antithesis would be between the wicked and the righteous, but it is between the wicked and the wise. The meaning clearly is that the wicked are not wise, and the wise not wicked. Of course wisdom is more than knowledge, but it includes it. So men must be

kept, as Jesus was, in both the knowledge and love of God; and as wisdom and righteousness are close of kin, so are knowledge and love, and over them, if they are to be safe, peace must reign.

The mind of Jesus was both wise and loving, and the abode of a peace which nothing could disturb. We can not think of him as being fearful lest his religion or men's belief in it, or faith in him, might be overthrown by any discovery of science, or by the acceptance of any scientific truth. He built his kingdom on an unshakable foundation, that is, his own sayings. "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house: and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock." Those sayings are contained in the Sermon on the Mount. No possible or conceivable scientific revelation can overthrow them, or touch them at any point. The first chapter of Genesis might or might not be a true account of creation, but it would still be

right to love one's enemies, to do one's alms in secret, not to judge, to be careless of earthly good, to seek first the kingdom of God, to be meek, pure in heart, humble in spirit, and to strive for peace among men.

There seems at the present time to be an almost unbridgeable gap between religion and knowledge, and it is the religionists that are making war on knowledge, and not men of knowledge on religion. The result is a situation that is most distressing and full of the gravest possibilities of evil. The remedy is to be found, not in any attempted reconciliation between religion and science, but in bringing forward, and emphasizing mind and knowledge as integral parts of religion without which it would swiftly degenerate into superstition of the grossest character. The real war is, not between religion and science, but between knowledge and obscurantism within the field of religion. What threatens is not the murder of religion and faith, but rather their suicide. One can almost hear the voice of Jesus saying: "Let there be light."

There are many self-styled defenders of the

faith abroad, but the faith they are defending is not the faith of Jesus, and there is the trouble. The faith of Jesus does not depend on any Old Testament miracle, or any miracle of the New Testament either, for that matter. It lives by reason of its inherent truth, through its correspondence with divine perfection, and with the best there is in man. It is like the fruit tree in Genesis, "yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself," and its fruit is like that of the tree of life mentioned in the Apocalypse whose leaves were "for the healing of the nations."

No one can study with any care the mind of Jesus as revealed in his words and acts without being impressed by the great part which reason and intelligence played in his revelation. His religion, as it was preached by him was as far removed from superstition as anything could be. There was no magic in it—nothing even faintly resembling or suggesting it. What engaged his mind was noble living, and the inspiration thereto. It is of course true that in his thought conduct meant a good deal more than conventional conformity to certain standards, no matter how

admirable they might be, for it meant also motive, sincerity of purpose, an inner attitude toward truth and holiness. He would have the children of God live as the children of God. Of his mind, knowledge and love were almost equal sharers. He *knew* that "greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

As there was no schism between the heart and mind of Jesus, so there should be none between the hearts and minds of his followers. We should try to think of his mind as quite as sacred as his heart, and of the one being as truly the source of his love for mankind as the other. Knowledge, if it is, as it ought to be, the partner of love, can not be "puffed up," and if, as it ought to be, love is the partner of knowledge, it can not be vapid sentimentalism. Reason is as divine as faith, for both are the gift of God, and through both God is expressed and revealed.

The great work to which Christians these days are, as I believe, called, is that of bridging the chasm, which so many seem bent on widening, between knowledge and faith, between religion

and reason. As there was no such chasm in the mind of Jesus, it is to that mind that we must go as the starting point of the campaign. The more it is studied as mind, the clearer will become the conviction that Christianity can not live apart from it, or without the closest communion with it. "The love of Jesus, what it is," we sing, "none but his loved ones know." "The mind of Jesus what it is!" Who knows?

Jesus has been treated by popular and evangelical Christianity almost as though he were in no sense an intellectual being. Yet in what philosopher can we find a match for his mind? But lest I be guilty of the patronage of eulogy, I forbear. Yet it must be said that the mind that has swayed the religious thought of the world for two thousand years, and that is to-day operating through men—and for that reason feebly—to carry the message of Jesus "to every creature," is worthy of every effort that Christians can make to understand it and enter into reverent and loving communion with it. He loved God because he knew him, and he "knew what was in man" and yet loved him. Men who know

without loving do not truly know; men who love without knowing do not truly love.

There must be both "the knowledge and love of God" before there can be any of God's peace in the human soul. Among the gifts of the Spirit as enumerated by Isaiah at least three of the seven have to do with the intellect—"the spirit of wisdom and understanding" and "the spirit of knowledge," and these were to be imparted in fullest measure to the promised and predicted Messiah. But we have been so busy with the ark and the flood, the tower of Babel, and the story of the halted sun, that we have overlooked Christ in the Old Testament, to our great spiritual loss.

# XXV

## PERSONALITY

I said in the beginning that the study of the mind of Jesus was a study in personality. As we draw near the end it may be fitting to think somewhat of the impression that that personality made on contemporaries. From those who heard the first sermon of Jesus and "were astonished at his doctrine," feeling that "he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes," clear down to Pilate who said, "I find in him no fault at all," even his enemies, felt that they were in the presence of an extraordinary being, and quite as extraordinary in repelling some as in attracting others. We have seen how deeply moved were the officers sent to arrest him, the soldier who stood at the foot of the Cross, all those who appealed to him for help, the sinful woman who anointed his feet, and many others.

But those who said "never man spake like this man" did not follow him. We turn to those who did follow him. At hardly more than a nod from him men left their callings, their homes and families, and all that they had, and enlisted under him.

In St. Matthew's Gospel we read: "Jesus, walking by the Sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea; for they were fishers. And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they straightway left their nets, and followed him. And going on from thence, he saw two other brethren, James, the son of Zebedee, and John, his brother, in a ship with Zebedee, their father, mending their nets; and he called them. And they immediately left the ship and their father, and followed him." St. Matthew records his own call thus: "And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw a man named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed him." In all these cases the response to the call was instantaneous. The

story of these events is told with the utmost simplicity, yet there have been few of greater importance or more momentous in human history.

Much has been written and preached about the weakness of these men and the other disciples, yet they clung to Jesus with a desperate loyalty, even after he had told them that they would be put out of the synagogue, persecuted, put to death, and that he himself was to die as a felon. No one who looks into his own heart and reads it aright, can fail to be humbled to the dust by the faithfulness and devotion of the men thus called. Later we have the case of St. Paul, an entirely different type, learned, a man of "position," who also heard the call, and was "not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." All of them, not excepting Judas, felt the enormous superiority of Jesus to themselves, Saul of Tarsus, the haughty Pharisee, quite as much as the humble fishermen. "Many of his disciples," so it is recorded, "went back, and walked no more with him. Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away?" Here is the answer of St. Peter, speaking for them all: "Lord to whom shall we

go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." There was nothing else in life for them. But long before this confession of faith, Simon Peter and the others had obeyed the call, and without a moment's hesitation.

What was the nature of the drawing power? Two things are clear, though they do not explain much. One is that Jesus saw something in those he summoned to his side that made it certain that they would respond; and the other is that they saw something in him that made it impossible for them to hold back. But as to what that "something" was in the two cases one can only speculate. All that I am trying to do is to make plain, as far as I can, the tremendous and overwhelming nature of the impression made by Jesus on the poor and unlettered men he drew about him. These events are so astounding that one can hardly imagine their taking place to-day. There is not a collector of customs in the land who, in response to the casual summons of a passing stranger, would "leave all, and follow him."

Yet we read the accounts of these happenings, or hear them read, quite calmly, without the least realization of their extraordinary character.

But these were not the only people who felt the power of Jesus. When on one occasion "Jesus went up into the temple, and taught," we are told that "the Jews marvelled, saying, How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" We may not with the intellectuals "admire" Jesus, but we must be filled with a sense of wonder and awe. Of course many, Nicodemus among them, were chiefly impressed by the miracles, yet even these were recognized as the manifestation and expression of a great personality. Nicodemus went so far in opposing the condemnation of Jesus on one occasion without a hearing that the rulers of the people said unto him: "Art thou also of Galilee?" This rich man was a disciple, though a secret one, as was Joseph of Arimathea, another high-placed and wealthy man.

Whatever was felt by the humble and unlearned men who so promptly responded to the call of Jesus, there can, I think, be no doubt that

such men as Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus—and even Pilate—felt the power of the mind of Jesus. One can not read the conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus without feeling that same power. So it has been from that day to this. Men still read his words, and, with the Jews of old, they marvel, and say to themselves: "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?"

One can readily understand the feelings of his old neighbors as reported by St. Matthew: "And when he was come into his own country, he taught them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were astonished, and said, Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these mighty works? Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? and his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this man all these things?" The fact that "they were offended in him" is less important than their recognition of his wisdom and power, and their wonder. There were few who came in contact with Jesus during his life on earth who

did not feel the impress of his mind and personality—this was true of his enemies, whom he so often routed.

There is one quality that I have reserved for the last, because in one sense it is the most important of all, and certainly does not now widely prevail, and is not generally esteemed or cultivated. I mean patience. The seed sown "on the good ground," Jesus said, "are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience." In his mind was no thought of forcing results. The law of his kingdom was the law of the harvest—"first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." *"So,"* he said, "is the Kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground, and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up and grow, he knoweth not how."

The growth of his kingdom was, as his mind conceived it, a sort of nature process, and could be hurried, if hurried at all, only by action in accordance with the laws of that process. He could wait—and did wait—without losing faith.

Indeed, he is waiting yet, with, we must believe, the same divine patience which he showed in his earthly life. It is written of a great man that "he took the large and patient view of life." That is infinitely more true of Jesus—is true absolutely.

But this great quality showed itself also in the relations of Jesus with men. He was patient with ignorance, misunderstanding, reproach, opposition and persecution—patient and calm in the last terrible hours of his life on earth. He was patient even with injustice as long as he alone was the victim of it. He labored with infinite patience to make his meaning and purpose clear to his wondering, puzzled and awed disciples. This marvelous quality shines forth in every line of his great discourses to them just before he was to leave them, and is inwrought in their very texture. Nothing could be tenderer than those discourses. Of patience Lowell has said that it is "the passion of great hearts." It is closely related to that love, and to that charity that "suffereth long, and is kind."

St. Paul, one of the most impulsive and stren-

uous of men, who sometimes gives the impression of being very much in a hurry, nevertheless did reflect in both his teaching and life the patience of Jesus. Writing to the Romans, he says that God "will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and immortality, eternal life." He would have his followers be "patient in tribulation." He bade the Thessalonians to "be patient toward all men," and he prayed that the Lord would direct their "hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ." "The servant of God," he writes to Timothy, "must be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient." "Be patient therefore, brethren," writes St. James, "unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receives the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient." Jesus is the incarnation of the divine patience, as of the divine life, love and truth. Of God the Psalmist says: "God is a righteous judge, strong and patient, and God is provoked every day."

"Strong and patient"—they go together as the endowment of a righteous judge.

Patience, as has been intimated, is not greatly admired or much cultivated in our fierce democracy. And yet, as we have seen, it is a divine trait. The hustlers and go-getters are our heroes. Our reformers, with the help of congress, would make the world over between sunrise and sunset. Even church people, a few years ago, proposed to convert the world to Christ in the present generation.

There is no conception of such things as natural, social and spiritual forces in cooperation with which it is necessary to work if any permanently good results are to be had. Speed, rush, hurry and push are our gods. Over against these towers the patience of Jesus, through which, and as a result of which, in very large measure, the face of civilization has been transformed. In that exquisite romance, *John Inglesant,* which we owe to the late J. H. Shorthouse, is this: "The ways are dark and foul, and the gray years bring a mysterious future which we can not see. We are like children, or men in a tennis court, and

before our conquest is half won the dim twilight comes and stops the game; nevertheless, let us keep our places, and above all things hold fast by the law of life we feel within. This was the method which Christ followed, and he won the world by placing himself in harmony with that law of gradual development which the divine wisdom has planned. Let us follow his steps and we shall attain to the ideal life; and, without waiting for our 'mortal passage,' tread the free and spacious streets of that Jerusalem which is above."

# XXVI

## CONCLUSION

So I come to the end of what I had to say, with a full and even painful consciousness of the inadequacy of the study, but also with the comforting and consoling assurance that any such study must of necessity be inadequate, so great is the theme. I should be pleased if what I have written be taken as at least an honest, humble and reverent attempt to throw some light, however feeble, on that theme, and to derive for myself some light from it. Of one thing I am convinced, and that is, that at this juncture, and facing the present crisis in the religious world, Christians should occasionally turn their thoughts from the body of Jesus—"this is my body"—and from his sacred heart, to his marvelous mind which, as revealed in the New Testament, and in

the lives of those nearest to him, is a priceless inheritance. How else can they know what he taught, or what were his purposes for mankind? If the Christian world thought as Jesus thought there could never have been a Dayton trial—never have been a Modernist or a Fundamentalist on the face of the earth. Nor would the words "orthodoxy" or "heterodoxy" ever have found their way into the dictionaries. Perhaps the source of unity must be found in the mind of Jesus—not simply in his teachings about which men may, and, I suppose, always will differ—but in that mind as an instrument by which truth was reached, and in the method of its working and its temper.

Men have written much about the "views" of Jesus, and champions of many causes, Socialism among them, have striven to prove that he was "on their side." Others have labored to prove that he was this or that sort of man, having first determined in their own mind what sort of man they would like to believe him to be. Certain labor leaders talk of Jesus as chiefly the friend of organized labor, quite forgetting how cruelly

selfish organized labor has often been. All this strikes me as rather futile. I do not for a moment imagine that I am free from preconceived notions, or doubt that they may have warped my judgment. It would be strange if it were not so. But my only desire has been to tell the truth as it seemed to me to be revealed in the documents from which alone the truth concerning the mind of Jesus can be learned.

It is not generally realized how little we actually know of Jesus compared with what we might have known. Yet as to this St. John is conclusive, for he says: "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." We should be grateful for what we have, and it is sufficient. Yet we can not but wonder what light that vast unwritten library would throw on the life and doctrine of Jesus. Jesus of course was entirely careless of his own fame, and indifferent to it. The only earthly immortality he sought was in the lives of his followers, and this he has had. He was even,

from the merely human point of view, careless as to the fate of his message. For, according to that same point of view, he trusted it to the most fallible agents, that is, weak men.

He himself wrote nothing, nor did he instruct or command others to write. The men who did write were, of course, divinely moved and inspired, but they had no earthly instruction from Jesus to write. There is a very important conclusion to be drawn from this carelessness—as I have called it—of Jesus. Where others trusted to records, he trusted to the living Spirit of God.

The conclusion is that the religion of Jesus is not, as so many people seem to think, the religion of a book or a book religion—it is the life of the living God in the soul of man and the world. It is a sort of blasphemy to attempt to shut up the Holy Spirit within the covers of the Bible—and the King James version! It is worse than blasphemy to think of the God of Joshua and the Judges as the God and Father of Jesus Christ. Such belief is of course in flat contradiction of the mind of Jesus, and in open and irreconcilable conflict with the method that he chose for the

perpetuation and communication of the truth. If we must have heretics, let us look for them among those who hold this bookish view, and we shall not look in vain.

When the apostles began their preaching mission there was not a line of the New Testament in existence, and the Gentiles to whom they preached had never even heard of the Old Testament, for it was wholly inaccessible to them. "So little," says Coleridge, "did the early bishops and preachers think their Christian faith wrapped up in and solely to be learned from the New Testament—indeed, can it be said that there was any such collection for three hundred years?—that I remember a letter from [name lost] to a friend of his, a bishop in the East, in which he most evidently speaks of the *Christian* Scriptures as works of which the bishop knew little or nothing."

Yet but for the sermons and letters of those first preachers, of which the New Testament is so largely composed, and the inspired work of the Evangelists, we should have known little of the words of Jesus, of which he said, "they are

spirit, and they are life." These records are vital, and inexpressibly precious, and are at least part of the answer to the question: "How will it be when none more saith, 'I saw?'" Through these records we become witnesses of what was done, hearers of what was said. Yet they are not Christianity, but the product and creation of Christianity working through its inspired teachers.

What is insisted on now is that there was, as far as we know, no thought in the mind of Jesus of perpetuating his message, life and influence through the biographical method, or of making his religion depend on any written word. He seems to have thought of the truth which he preached as an ever-growing, ever-expanding life and force, as something which was to be experienced rather than read about. The two Testaments are a beautiful, but incomplete revelation of Jesus. The great revelation is through individual experience, precisely as it was when Jesus walked the earth. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock." We must think of Jesus as a living personality, "alive forevermore," and not

merely as a historic figure, or the subject of biography.

And no revelation of Jesus can even approach completeness that does not include his mind, and, if it is to be the fruit of experience, that experience must be in part—in large part, as I believe—intellectual. There is nothing in these perplexing days more needed than the enlightenment, enrichment and sanctification of the human mind. It is time to have done with the cheap sneer at intellect and the intellectual life as "high-brow." There is nothing nobler in this world than a great mind, except only a clean soul and a pure heart. All were included in the personality of Jesus. The closer one gets to that mind the more strongly is its stimulating and fructifying power felt. The Psalmist said: "Thou shalt renew the face of the earth." It was the mission of Jesus to renew human nature—and civilization. We must think of him, not as one who did his work two thousand years ago, and then left man to himself, but as an active force in human affairs, still operating. Again we go to Browning's St. John:

"To me, that story,—ay, that Life and Death
Of which I wrote 'it was'—to me, it is;
—Is, here and now: I apprehend naught else.
Is not God now i' the world his power first made?
Is not his love at issue still with sin,
Visibly when a wrong is done on earth?
Love, wrong and pain, what see I else around?
Yea, and the Resurrection and Uprise
To the right hand of the throne—what is it beside,
When such truth, breaking bounds, o'erfloods
my soul,
And as I saw the sin and death, even so
See I the need yet transiency of both,
The good and glory consummated thence?"

To one who can get some such vision as that there can never come a time "when none more saith 'I saw,'" for to such a one "that Life and Death" are ever contemporary, and not merely imbedded in a book. Did he not himself say: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world"? Our very life depends on his life, for he also said: "Because I live, ye shall live also." To the Christian, his Lord and Master should be an ever-living and ever-thinking Christ.

Matthew Arnold defined the catholic church as "the prophetic soul of the wide world dream-

ing on things to come." We may quarrel with the definition, or at least decline to accept it, and I do not suppose that even its author would claim scientific exactness for it, but it is to his credit that he did not define the catholic church in terms of machinery. We are certainly all interested in "things to come." What shall they be—what shall they be for the religion of Jesus? "The signs of the times," in the light of which the future should be read, are perplexing and even ominous.

In the days which many of us will not see, Christianity may be a vital force, working salvation in the lives of men and nations, or a cast-iron system, a system existing only for its own sake, with no renewing influence or reviving power. Perhaps "the signs of the times" point to the latter alternative. Yet to believe this would be to betray a lack of faith in the love and power and mind of God, and a distrust of the promises of Jesus. "And as he went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here! And Jesus answering said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? There

shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." And it was so. Christian temples may not meet with the fate suffered by the temple at Jerusalem, but they may become the tombs, chill and mouldy, of a dead faith and a dead Christ.

Let us not end, however, on so gloomy a note. For there are many signs of a renewed life in Christianity, and certainly there is a greater interest in it than there has been for many years. Men do long for leadership, and more and more are they likely to turn for it to him who is "the way, the truth, and the life." The last word is for members of organized Christianity, and it is the word of Jesus: "Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness." Only as they are loyal to Jesus in thought, word and deed, can men and women be loyal to the kingdom, while so-called loyalty to the kingdom may be anything but loyalty—may even be treason—to Jesus.

THE END

GELICAL
OGY

DATE DUE

9RN
.50
Xr. 39

BT 590 .I6 H68 1926
Howland, Louis, 1857-
The mind of Jesus

"If It's a Religious Book
Try Blessings"
Blessing Book Stores, Inc.
Chicago

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BT590.I6 H68 1926
Howland, Loui The mind of Jesus /
3 0645 0004 0054 5